James J. Martin

MEN AGAINST THE STATE

From the collection of the

Prelinger Library

San Francisco, California
2008

EΦ
MH
9

MEN AGAINST THE STATE

The Expositors of Individualist Anarchism in America, 1827-1908

by

JAMES J. MARTIN

RALPH MYLES PUBLISHER, INC.
COLORADO SPRINGS
1970

Copyright 1953 by James J. Martin

Ralph Myles Publisher, Inc. Colorado Springs, 1970.

PUBLICATION HISTORY

First published by Adrian Allen Associates, DeKalb, Illinois, in April, 1953.

Re-published by Libertarian Book Club, New York, N. Y., in April, 1957 in both hard cover and paper cover printings.

Published for the third time by Ralph Myles Publisher, Inc., of Colorado Springs, Colorado in April, 1970, in a Linotype composition, paper cover edition for the first time, incorporating minor changes.

INTRODUCTION

The writing of a history of anarchism in the United States will run into the difficulties created by the necessity of establishing criteria for the purpose of separating anarchism from other expressions of radical social thought which may be allied to but are distinct from it. On the verbal level the most perplexing problem is that of definition of terms, beginning with the basic word itself. In one respect the obstruction may never be bridged. An almost insuperable barrier has been the matter of semantics. The use of the term as an identification for a social order characterized by the absence of the State is quite recent. As used by Pierre Joseph Proudhon in this way, it is hardly more than a century old. However, its association with reprehensibility in this country has generally greatly restricted its use for descriptive purposes. European radicals have been far less inhibited in this way, hence the study of anarchism there is relatively unimpeded by hesitancy on the part of radicals to disclose themselves. Their propaganda has been open and identified, and thus may be readily examined.

The reluctance to openly declare positions which has been a periodic matter of concern in all areas of radicalism in America makes such an approach here out of the question. Thus the problem of discovering anarchist literature and sentiments when disguised as something else. The constant use of less highly-charged words to describe anarchist propaganda is still another situation which is essentially American. In such a way, anarchist doctrines have found acceptance here when identification as the former would have produced a general flight away from it, so sinister have been the associative connotations of the word. In view of such a situation, it is not peculiar that the study of anarchism involves the necessity of escaping the limits of the word itself. On the other hand, the indiscriminate use of the word makes it imperative that all professions of it be examined. A vast number of ideas which have nothing to do with anarchism are often purported to be such, resulting in distortion, deliberate or otherwise.

It has been evident to thoughtful observers for more than two generations that the words "anarchist," "anarchism," and "anarchy" have been used so loosely by writers and the general public alike that they have practically ceased to have any definite meaning. The problem here is similar to that existing in many other cases where abstract terms or generalizations having no or little substance have been overused or misused.[1]

---

[1] An example of the problem involved in the matter of accurately using such specialized words can be found in the interesting study by Arthur E. Bestor, Jr., "The Evolution of the Socialist Vocabulary," in *Journal of the History of Ideas,* IX (June, 1948), 259-302.

Nor has the use of these terms by scholars tended to promote any greater degree of understanding. In too many cases the tendency has been to resemble the weaknesses of the general observer. Here the situation has been usually created by the repeated interpretation of expressions of hostility to the status quo as evidence of anarchist thought.[2]

The idea has long been prevalent that violent conduct is characteristic of anarchists, and that anarchism is a doctrine of destruction.[3] There exists little justification for such a stand, in actuality. In addition, the rejection of one particular variety of authority in favor of its replacement by another finds continual identification with anarchism, while social philosophies which are utterly opposed to it are on occasion labeled "anarchistic." This merely adds to the already large amount of confusion existing on the subject, setting up extremely vague limitations and permitting the inclusion of many elements which are quite controversial.

Mere dissatisfaction with or opposition to the existing order anywhere is gravely insufficient to serve as evidence of anarchist sentiments. Nor is a program of pure negation or obstructionism more than faintly related; anarchists are not advocates of replacing something with nothing. An example of presumption is the widespread interchangeable use of the terms "nihilism" and "anarchism." Actually, the anarchist proposes specific solutions for social problems. His occasional tendency to mask them by encouraging the greater disintegration and decay of the older order may lead to identifying him with an element which desires planless, cumulative revolutionary disorder. But the anarchist and those enamored with perpetual revolutionary dynamism part company long before this.

---

[2] Ernest A. Vizetelly, *The Anarchists* (London, 1911), and Peter Latouche, *Anarchy! An Authentic Exposition of the Methods of Anarchists and the Aims of Anarchism* (London, 1908), are prime examples of popular writing concerned with anarchism primarily as a program of calculated terrorism aimed in particular to those in high places. Latouche, in his zeal to lay all prominent international political assassinations at the door of the anarchists, even included those of Presidents Lincoln and Garfield. *Anarchy!*, 238. For vindication of the employment of violence by anarchists, see Peter A. Kropotkin, article "Anarchism," *Encyclopedia Britannica*, XI ed., (29 vols. London, 1910), I, 916.

[3] There is virtually no credible evidence for the assumption that violence is a basic element of the strategy of the anarchists. In distinguishing between the doctrine and the coercive action sometimes associated with it, the non-anarchist German observer and critic Ernst Victor Zenker remarked, "That the theory of Anarchism is not merely a systematic incitement to robbery and murder, we need hardly to repeat. . . . Proudhon and Stirner . . . never once preached force. . . . The doctrine of propaganda which since Proudhon's time has always accompanied a certain form of anarchist theory, is a foreign element, having no necessary or internal connection with the fundamental ideas of anarchism. It is simply a piece of tactics borrowed from the circumstances peculiar to Russia, and accepted moreover only by one fraction of the Anarchists, and approved by very few indeed in its most crude form; it is merely the old tactics of all revolutionary parties in every age." *Anarchism, a Criticism and History of Anarchist Theory* (English translation, New York, 1897), 306.

A history of anarchism, therefore, becomes progressively more difficult to undertake if it is assumed that all that has the appearance of anarchist philosophy as conventionally understood properly comes within the purview of such a study. Careful reflection on the issue leads one to observe that the loose application of the term "anarchy" as a synonym for chaos is a verbal reflex based on a conditioned semantic response. This patently ignores one of the fundamental principles on which most of the varied schools of belief in the ideal of the stateless society are grounded. The last century, with its all-pervading atmosphere of nationalism, has been especially hostile to such thinking, as was an earlier era of religious authoritarianism. And as the problems produced by the conflicting national policies have encouraged the elaboration of totalitarian schemes as solutions, the resistance to anarchistic thinking has grown apace. The belief that abolition of external coercion or control is an impossibility, or at best a probability of the most remote and impractical order, has prevailed, and is now virtually unquestioned. Even among those least satisfied with the structure of world society, the assumption that institutional government is absolutely necessary as a starting point is universally held. The fear of the disappearance of traditional values and modes of behavior thought worthy of preservation without the bulwark provided by institutionalism is expressed implicitly here.

It can thus be seen that the peripheral area of anarchism becomes as extended as desired, depending upon the object sought. It is possible, for instance, to take a running start from the early seventeenth century, as has been done, recording the varied social protests since that time and sifting their content for what may have significance in the delineation of antistatist thought. In addition, the writings of a great variety of thinkers from that time to this may be strained for quotations which have the semblance of anarchist sentiment and connotation when abstracted out of context. Thus it becomes possible, as does Rudolf Rocker, to include even such personages as Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln on the fringe of the anarchist fold. It might be mentioned at this point that the area of overlapping of liberal and anarchist ideas is itself a full scale study, which can only be indicated in such a work as this. Even such pertinent figures as William Godwin and Robert Owen can easily be overextended when one is engaged in elaborating the development of anarchism in the United States. And it has been remarked upon elsewhere that when considered from the point of view of a consistent school of thought, the radical writing of even Henry David Thoreau has far more pertinence to the abolitionist rather than the anarchist movement. Thoreau's pamphleteering was discovered by the radicals a generation after it had ceased, and the extent of Thoreau's anarchism is a highly debatable matter.

With respect to the United States, especially, the stretching of the term "anarchism" to apply to all the variety of vague and dimly felt resentments toward authority which have been discerned in the history of American dissension from colonial New England days to the present is now questionable. It appears increasingly probable that expressions of well-organized arguments against the State date from the first quarter of the nineteenth century, and represent more accurately a reaction to the complex problems produced by the growth of urbanism, industrialism, and the expansion of the modern national state. Observations of isolated expressions containing particles of anarchistic thought can be made, but the difficulty of presenting them in any logical sequence has yet to be surmounted. The element of relation or continuity is absent, and their contribution to a sustained integrated propaganda is tenuous at best. More often than not they are isolated phenomena which lack any central theme or point of polarization.

Since 1880 and thereabouts people have almost universally thought of anarchists in terms of violence and conspiracy. The result has been the regarding of anarchist literature as a product of a handful of criminals. In Europe the advent of this revolutionary movement was accompanied by a number of sensational acts which led to the identification of anarchism with socially pathological developments.[4] In the United States there have been similar implications, to the point where even governmental policy incorporated the layman's conception of anarchism and anarchists. The definition of anarchism employed by the Department of Justice in modern times is essentially derived from this earlier period.

Although the tendency to blame destruction of property and loss of life during industrial disputes on "agitators," "doctrinaires," and "communists" prevailed for some time previous to the celebrated Haymarket incident in Chicago in May, 1886, such predilections received a powerful stimulus from this event.[5] The now-familiar stereotype of the black whiskered, bomb-throwing vandal came into being at this time and created a new political symbol which has been used to manipulate mass opinion with an impressive degree of success.[6] As a consequence of this and other factors, anarchism became so tainted with diabolism that rational study of its place in American history has rarely taken place.

---

[4] Zenker, *Anarchism,* 6. An early and exhaustive inquiry into the matter is Césare Lombroso, *Gli Anarchici* (Turin, 1894). A German edition was published in Hamburg the next year under the title *Die Anarchisten. Eine Kriminal Psychologische und Sociologische Studie.* Lombroso's methods and techniques as well as most of his conclusions have been discarded for some time.

[5] Henry David, *The History of the Haymarket Affair,* continues to be the most thorough account of this unfortunate occurrence. In American history the identification of anarchism with terroristic activities dates from this time, an impression which neither time nor attempts at rectification of the injustice inflicted at the time have succeeded in erasing.

[6] An accompanying attitude has been the double standard which has tacitly been adhered to with respect to the employment of extra-legal violence. No public condemnation accompanied the use of coercion on the part of industrialists and local groups of citizenry, acting in a vigilante capacity, in dis-

General conclusions as to the basis of anarchist opposition to conventionally-constituted government have more often than not been based on something less than a scholarly investigation of libertarian literature. To make matters worse, the frame of reference, liberal or otherwise, of most writers who have approached the subject has markedly contributed to promoting attempts to demolish anarchism by the polemical method, rather than presenting the record. There has tended to be too much interpretation based on far too little factual data. It was the conclusion of Ernst Victor Zenker, a serious critic of anarchism and writer of one of the few substantial volumes on the subject in the last century, that hardly a critic of anarchism with whom he was familiar had ever read *any* anarchist writings. Objective writing on the subject is so meager and threadbare that the *Encyclopedia Britannica* has depended on the anarchist Peter Kropotkin's article for over a generation and a half in presenting the matter of anarchism to the general reader. Surveys of anarchism such as that contained in Gerald Brenan's *The Spanish Labyrinth* are exceedingly rare.

The preparation of this study has taken place with most of the foregoing complexities in mind, and is therefore presented with distinct limits upon its scope. It is made with the hope that it may help to establish a method of approach to the problem of a critical survey of the whole radical movement in America. American history reveals a vast amount of native thought and action which may be arranged under the general heading of anarchism, but much of it is so disjointed and sporadic that no comprehensive and logical picture can be constructed from it. It is with the attempt to establish more universal criteria to make possible a more careful examination of anarchism that this study is also concerned.

When anarchism in its several forms, including its theoretical statements and practical experiments, is analyzed structurally, it generally separates into three broad areas of tactics and strategy; (a) a rejection of constituted authority as the source of social dynamism and equilibrium; (b) a refusal to collaborate with the existing order anywhere through participation in any program of reformism; (c) the promotion of a variety of non-coercive alternatives of quite clearly defined nature as a substitute. Within this framework the various schools of anarchism have developed a number of sectarian variants, and some of these elaborations have created bitter doctrinal controversies. The result has been the erection of barriers fully as steep among the anarchists as those existing between them and the conventional world. The thread of

---

putes with strikers and radicals, until very recently. For an account of this matter see Robert Hunter, *Violence and the Labor Movement* (New York, 1914), 276-326.

violence which has criss-crossed through this is, however, not an integral part of the fabric. Too often it has been mistaken by superficial observers to be the whole cloth.

Nearly all scholarly attention directed toward anarchism in America has been along political lines. With the possible exception of Richard T. Ely and the John R. Commons associates, practically no one has examined the economics of anarchism. This preoccupation with the political has also been responsible for the inclusion in anarchist ranks of several radical fringe groups and individuals who do not belong there. The most important discussion by an American of the politics of anarchism thus far has been that of Charles Edward Merriam. For over thirty years it has been referred to constantly. The only academic treatise devoted exclusively to anarchism in America, Eunice Minette Schuster's *Native American Anarchism,* which appeared in 1931, gives extensive evidence of its influence. Merriam's studies began with an observation of the similarity between anarchistic sentiments and the expressions of the Antinomian rebels of seventeenth century Massachusetts Bay. The narrative was carried through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, stressing especially Henry David Thoreau, the Garrisonian wing of "no government" abolitionists, and a number of religious dissident splinter aggregations, such as the enclaves of John Humphrey Noyes and Adin Ballou. The survey included a discussion of the individualist-mutualist anarchism, concluding with special attention being paid to the imported anarchism which made its way to the United States from Germany and Russia between 1880 and 1905.

The attempt to link these varied phenomena into a logical sequence has been undertaken by others as well, with less success. It now appears that the assumption that American anarchism stemmed from Puritan Antinomianism and was associated with the peculiar variety of resistance to the state found in the non-resistant and "no government" sentiments of the Garrison school of "Christian Anarchist" abolitionists is untenable. It is more probable that, rather than being a derivative of native American conditions, the real source of the anti-statist evidences observed in Antinomianism and other varieties of early colonial dissidence and unrest can be discovered in the radicalism, both religious and socio-economic, already developing in England before the times of Charles I, and which found expression through lower class spokesmen at the time of the English Civil War.[7] Concerning other aspects of this matter, it can be argued quite effectively that the designation "Christian Anarchist" is really a contradiction in terms, and that religious rebellion along individualist lines can be interpreted as anarchism only under highly specialized circumstances. The rejection of one variety of religious authority in favor of its replacement by another can hardly be related to anarchism, which categorically rejects authority. In another connection, the interpretation of American anti-statism as an evolutionary process, passing from religious to economic spheres, is also open to serious objections. There is not only lack of continuity in influence, but no logical sequence in the elaboration of a program of propaganda. In searching the field it becomes more apparent that the elements of a radical movement with a fully developed propaganda structure can be found in one of the sub-areas only. It is the contention of this work that individualist anarchism can be seen to satisfy the requirements mentioned elsewhere. Not only is it the only part of the radical movement native to America with a propaganda, but it has depended on natives for its promotion. Furthermore, it is unique in that members of the group actually attempted under practical conditions to try out its theory.

---

[7] See especially David W. Petegorsky, *Left Wing Democracy in the English Civil War; A Study of the Social Philosophy of Gerrard Winstanley* (London, 1947), Chapters I-V, and Mildred A. Gibb, *John Lilburne, The Leveller* (London, 1947), introduction. See also Mosca, *Ruling Classes,* 271-272, for the advancement of a cyclical theory dealing with the persistence of anarchist and allied sentiments in the ancient literature of China, India, Persia, Israel, Greece and Rome, and continuing down through the Christian Fathers and the Muslims. The influence of Merriam's view on subsequent writers dealing with anarchism in the United States is readily observable, however.

The heavy weight of European influence has concentrated attention on the development of the anarchism there. The penetration of this type of revolutionary thought into working class consciousness and its emergence as syndicalism probably justifies this, since in this form it has been the only real competitor to Marxism in the radical arena in the last eighty years. However, paralleling it chronologically was a kindred but nearly unconnected phenomenon in America, seeking the same ends through individualistic rather than collectivistic dynamics. American writers concerned with the reform movements of the nineteenth century have likewise paid little attention to it, except occasional notice of it as a symptom of economic unrest. Its evolution from the practical stages as a frontier experiment in individual sovereignty and "equitable commerce" to the theoretical and intellectual pamphleteering of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is the major concern here.

In the United States there seems to have been little notice of an extensive literature hostile to the state and its functions until after Haymarket. The dominant conception of anarchism after the violence in Chicago was in accord with the inflammatory utterances of the European-born revolutionaries now gathered in the several large Northern cities. Lack of attention had resulted in the failure to note that a serious split had been developing within the worldwide anarchist movement, and that various distinct elements could now be recognized.[8]

---

[8] The 1880's saw the presence in the United States of anarchists in numbers almost equal to those of socialists. Morris Hillquit, *Loose Leaves from a Busy Life* (New York, 1934), 4.

The semantic smokescreen raised up by the moral uproar here and overseas after Haymarket and a number of sensational assassinations in Europe covered over in the process the uncompromising stand taken by the American individualist anarchists, who deplored the use of force, or "direct action," and asserted as before their traditional hope of the eventual adoption of noncoercive individualist equity as a result of education and rational conviction.[9] Much of what they had to say had been propagated here for nearly a half century before there developed a competing body of beliefs put forward by followers of Bakunin and Kropotkin. In the form in which it appeared during the 80's and 90's, but especially as broadcast by Emma Goldman, Alexander Berkman and other Russians after the turn of the century, it is possible to see emerging the full outlines of what has since become known as communist anarchism.[10] It has since received its best statement by Italian and Spanish radicals. (Further examination of the famed Haymarket Germans suggests a serious question as to whether these men were not far closer to state socialism, actually, than anarchism.)

The two groups differed sharply on basic issues. The communist anarchists rejected private property, and taught the ideal of the collective autonomous commune. A portion of their number advocated the overthrow of the State by violence.[11] The individualist anarchists held that the collective society in any form was an impossibility without the eventuality of authoritarianism, and ultimately, totalitarianism, and adhered resolutely to the concept of private property insofar as the term could be defined as the total product of a given individual's labor, but not more broadly than this. They abandoned the idea of an equalitarian utopia, and worked for a world free from arbitrary restrictions on opportunity and legal privilege, which breakdowns they claimed "laissez faire" really produced.[12] No other radical group denounced the prevailing system more vigorously than the spokesmen for individualist anarchism.

---

[9] For a presentation of this matter as it came to a head at the time of the badly-ignored Anarchist convention in Pittsburgh in 1883, see Chester McA. Destler, "Shall Red and Black Unite? An American Revolutionary Document of 1883," in *Pacific Historical Review,* XIV (December, 1945), 434-451.

[10] For brief expert summaries of both "schools" from the individualist point of view see Victor Yarros, article "Individualist or Philosophical Anarchism," 41-45, and Clarence Lee Swartz, article "Anarchist Communism," 45-50, in William D. P. Bliss and Rudolph M. Binder, (eds.), *The New Encyclopedia of Social Reform* (New York, 1908). For an admirable and sympathetic treatment of the European anarchist philosophy and its exponents by a conservative, consult Alvan F. Sanborn, *Paris and the Social Revolution* (Boston, 1905), Chapters I-VII.

[11] For other aspects of this conflict consult Ernest Armand, *Formas de Vida en común sin Estado no Autoridad* (Carlos Espinosa, trans.) (Madrid, 1934); Rudolf Rocker, *Nationalism and Culture* (Los Angeles, 1937); same author, *La Juventud de un Rebelde* (Buenos Aires, 1947); Helmut Rüdiger, *Federalismen* (Stockholm, 1947).

The growth of totalitarianism and the evident hiatus between the theory and the actuality of mass revolution in modern times has brought an occasional admission of worth in the philosophical premises of the individualist school by the press of the followers of Kropotkin. See for instance the reprinting of the individualist anarchist Ernest Armand's article "La Société Future," originally included in *L'Encyclopédie Anarchiste,* IV, 2611-2614, by the libertarian review *Resistance,* VII (May-June, 1948), 5-8, in an English translation.

The individualist anarchists had no blueprint for the future of social organizations under conditions free from coercion. The direction to be taken by voluntary associations was left for the future, and no predictions of a static millennium filled their writing. The group had within their number adherents to a system of decentralized local communities of small size, and at the same time proponents of free associations of producers and consumers within large urban industrial centers. The best known of this group of native radicals, Josiah Warren, Lysander Spooner, Stephen Pearl Andrews, William B. Greene, Ezra Heywood, and Benjamin R. Tucker, came in for a measure of attention during the peak of the furor over radicalism reached at about the time of the Spanish-American War. But the greater part of the attention of the time was focussed on their German and Russian contemporaries, with whom they were already at variance in many respects. Those most familiar with the individualist suggestions for the solution of the currency, labor and other pressing problems dismissed them as the fulminations of a group of irresponsibles, dreamers and cranks.[13] Their work along practical lines at an earlier time was practically unknown in any circles, and much of what they had to say later on was mostly forgotten when the stage was taken over by the Industrial Workers of the World, The Socialist Party and the First International.

In undertaking an exhaustive examination of the whole individualist anarchist movement, the present study produces a number of conclusions and interpretations which differ somewhat from earlier piece-meal studies of anarchist thought and action. A few examples may be given. A full study of the known printed works of Josiah Warren has resulted in the dismissal of the previous assertion that Warren was a son of the celebrated Revolutionary War general. The facts reveal only an intimation of kinship at best. In addition, the former assumption of Warren's originality in promoting the ticket system of labor note currency does not hold up in the face of repeated admissions by Warren himself of the prior sponsorship by Robert Owen. Warren can be credited only with the first practical adaptation of this system. Previous studies, on the other hand, have tended to overlook the numerous community founding attempts under Warren's instigation, which are fully covered here.

---

[12] "In a world where inequality of ability is inevitable, anarchists do not sanction any attempt to produce equality by artificial or authoritarian means. The only equality they posit and will strive their utmost to defend is the *equality of opportunity*. This necessitates the maximum amount of freedom for each individual. This will not necessarily result in equality of incomes or of wealth but will result in returns *proportionate to service rendered*. To base society on the supposition that the laborer of great capacity will content himself, in favor of the weak, with half his wages, furnish his services gratuitously, and produce for that abstraction called "society," in the words of Proudhon, 'is to base society on a sentiment, . . . which, erected systematically into a principle, is only a false virtue, a dangerous hypocrisy.' A hypocrisy, unfortunately, eagerly subscribed to by a weak, downtrodden, and misguided portion of the populace." Quoted from Laurance Labadie, *Anarchism Applied to Economics* (a leaflet). Emphasized portions are his.

[13] For example, the presence at the Warrenite colony of "Modern Times" of such a wide variety of the most extreme types of unconventional behavior has resulted in the estimation of this experiment in anarchist voluntarism as a gathering of spiritualists, Fourierites, free lovers, Comtean Positivists, and even Swedenborgians. Scarcity of contemporary accounts is in a large way responsible for the confusion of interpretations.

The discovery of new materials indicates that Warren and William B. Greene were aware rather than ignorant of each other's work. Greene, generally advanced as an exponent of the ideas of Pierre Joseph Proudhon, appears now to have been more a product of the currency radicalism that accompanied and followed the business and financial panic of 1837. His own ideas, which made a permanent impression on American anarchist economics, stand far closer to the thinking of American contemporaries such as Edward Kellogg rather than to Proudhonian "mutualism." If anything, Greene was more a critic than follower of the famous French radical.

A new factor in the person of Joshua K. Ingalls appears as a result of an examination of the origin of anarchist ideas about land. And at the same time, the major figure in the promotion of individualist anarchism in its mature form, Benjamin R. Tucker, becomes less an original and more an eclectic figure. Tucker is the cultural synthesis of the earlier exponents and innovators of the various elements of which this variety of American radicalism was composed.

No pretense is made of exhaustively investigating the relationships between individualist anarchism and the large number of contemporary fragments of radicalism, regardless of rationale. Neither Owenism nor Fourierism of the pre-Civil War period nor the various socialisms and collectivist anarchism of the latter half of the nineteenth century are treated except where they furnish personalities to the individualist anarchist movement or ideas to the individualist anarchist intellectual arsenal, or opposition to pitch individualist anarchist attacks against. In the history of individualist anarchism these are peripheral areas.

There are distinct and noticeable limitations in the presentation of this monograph especially as a result of the sparse interpretation and the reluctance to throw the subject of anarchism against the broader backdrop of American social history in a more sweeping and dramatic manner. But it must be remembered that the object sought in this case has not been a comprehensive history of anarchism in America. The emphasis has been upon the careful documentation of its major phase.

The basic assumption has been that since the thought and action of the movement has been so elusive and inaccessible, it must be put on record fully before its integration in a more comprehensive account of the intellectual and social history of American radicalism can be effectively undertaken.

Ann Arbor, Michigan
December, 1952

JAMES J. MARTIN

To the memory of

AGNES INGLIS

Individualist

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction iii

Chapter

I. **Josiah Warren and the Birth of the Equitist Ideal** 1

II. **Spring Hill, Tuscarawas and the New Harmony Interlude** 26

III. **The "Colonial Period": "Utopia" and "Modern Times"** 56

IV. **The Fragmentation and Decline of Anarchist Experimentation** 88

V. **Heralds of the Transition to Philosophical Egoism I** 103
- *1. Ezra Heywood, Pamphleteer* 105
- *2. William B. Greene, Money Reformer* 125

VI. **Heralds of the Transition to Philosophical Egoism II** 139
- *3. J. K. Ingalls, Land Reformer* 139
- *4. Stephen Pearl Andrews, Social Philosopher* 153

VII. **Lysander Spooner, Dissident Among Dissidents** 167

VIII. **Benjamin R. Tucker and the Age of *Liberty* I** 202
- *1. Intellectual Heir of Native Anarchist Traditions* 202
- *2. Theoretical Anarchism Matured* 208
- *3. Tucker, the Radicals and Reform* 219

IX. **Benjamin R. Tucker and the Age of *Liberty* II** 234
- *4. Victor S. Yarros Delineates the Spencerian Influence* 234
- *5. Stirnerism and the Tucker Associates* 241
- *6.* Liberty *as a Journal and Mirror of Contemporary History* 261
- *7. The Decline of Individualist Anarchism as a Conscious Movement* 271

Bibliographical Essay 279

Appendix I 289

Appendix II 292

Index of Names and Authors 310

ILLUSTRATIONS

Between pages 102-103:

JOSIAH WARREN

EZRA HEYWOOD

LYSANDER SPOONER

BENJAMIN R. TUCKER

The history of these photographs is obscure but their authenticity is without question. Those of Warren and Heywood have never before been published.

The publishers are indebted to Laurance Labadie for his graciousness in supplying the pictures of Spooner and Heywood.

The Warren portrait, taken in Boston, probably around 1870, was supplied to the author of this book by the widow of Benjamin R. Tucker, the late Pearl Johnson Tucker, in 1947. There are no other known pictures of Warren.

Details concerning the Heywood and Spooner pictures are unavailable. It is probable that they were also taken in Boston, perhaps between 1880 and 1885. The Spooner picture was published in the 1966 reprint of his *No Treason* and *Letter to Thomas F. Bayard.*

The photograph of Tucker first was published as the frontispiece to his *Instead of a Book* in 1893, and would appear to be a likeness of him when he was thirty-eight or thirty-nine years of age. It was undoubtedly made in New York City.

CHAPTER I

Josiah Warren and the Birth of the Equitist Ideal

Twentieth century America has seen the apparent triumph of the industrial over the agrarian way of life, and the victory of centralized government over the forces of federalism, decentralization, and local rule. In the face of the perennial American fear of big government, with its attending factors of corruption, graft and gradual escape from the observation of the people at large, the success of this development is somewhat anomalous. The mechanization of industry on a large scale and the accompanying rationalization of productive techniques, along with the impact of machines upon transportation and communication, have been important if not the most important reasons underlying the decay of direct democracy, and several of the ideals associated with it. In place of a firm belief in the virtues of the average man and his ability to participate in the governing process, there has arisen an attitude toward the complexity of governmental problems consisting primarily of fear and rejection, accompanied by a resignation of responsibility into the hands of ever-growing bodies of impersonal agencies. The result has been an even greater withdrawal of the seat of action from the citizenry, along with a tendency to couch the language of governmental intercourse in highly specialized terms. In the meantime one observes the development of a mystical respect for governmental specialists. The age of the managerial state has surely begun.

The crystallization of the means of political expression into a conventional series of ritual-like gestures has had perturbing repercussions. Their apparent finality has produced apprehension among those people who adhere to Jeffersonian simplicity as a fundamental requirement for the survival of individual liberty and the restriction of institutions to end functions rather than allowing them to become ends in themselves. This removal of much of government from personal scrutiny has resulted in a disturbing apathy toward public affairs on the part of a growing minority of intelligent Americans. Concentration of political power in fewer and fewer hands has not been obstructed by intermittent turnovers of personnel of the "housecleaning" variety; the replacement of political machines by other political machines has been made apparent repeatedly. This, in turn, has fostered widespread feelings of frustration and cynicism toward the electoral process which have further contributed to the erosion of basic democratic assumptions.

While passivity and withdrawal have been means of countering such developments in the field of political expression, phenomena of a far more aggressive sort have become apparent in other areas of conduct. The influence of technology in promoting a dead level of cultural uniformity has been matched by a growing pressure of insistence upon intellectual and cultural conformity, and the lovers of liberty have been increasingly hard-pressed to escape the sanctions provided for cases of persistent violation. That such a condition has reached the status of a public virtue in bureaucratic and police states we are becoming more and more aware of, and in America the struggle to keep professions of radicalism of *all* kinds from becoming labeled subversive and circumspect continues on a number of fronts.

In the United States of Andrew Jackson's day, a rising nationalism was still too loosely interpreted to regard social and intellectual recalcitrancy as a threat to national existence and survival. A large segment of the population looked upon incipient bigness with deep suspicion and continual condemnation. Reform, in all the multi-hued conceptions of the term, was making itself felt in a multitude of ways. Institutions of all types which, in an age of ceaseless mechanical revolution, are clung to with a reverence and fervor somewhat reminiscent of ancestor worship, were then being attacked from all sides with a gusto which has rarely been observed since. A welter of reform movements already was penetrating America to its furthest territorial reaches, the ultimate effect being the prevention of a solidification of American thought for almost two generations. Only a long and catastrophic civil war was to provide the proper psychological stimulus for centralization, in an environment being made more favorable toward its growth by technology.

The longing for reform on the part of those who sought to make the land a kingdom of God on earth took diverse routes. Peace, anti-slavery, temperance, bible and tract societies; religious revivalism, women's rights and moral reform; these and a host of lesser agencies created a tremendous intellectual unrest throughout all parts of the country.[1] However, the desire to bring about the millennium took form in other ways than in attempts at political and moral readjustment. Society was fluid enough to tolerate experiments for a reconstruction of the economic order as well. When translated into action, these proposals invariably took the form of independent colonies or communities, experimental in character, striving to become self-contained, and often quite unconventional. Self-sufficiency, in fact, often was the principal objective.[2] Shielded for decades from widespread public notice by better known radical and reform activities, many of the unorthodox economic and social ideas nurtured in these communities survived their more widely famed, yet more ephemeral contemporaries.

---

[1] Alice Felt Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment; Phases of American Social History to 1860,* is the most recent and satisfactory treatment of this upheaval in American social and intellectual life.

[2] The spirit of community life can be ascertained to some extent in William Alfred Hinds, *American Communities* (Chicago, 1902), and in a more pop-

Between 1800 and 1850 a bewildering variety of colonies and communities sprang into existence from Illinois eastward to the seaboard.[3] All entertained some element or other of the underlying conviction that spiritual and material well-being were states best brought about through action undertaken by small groups of people of similar minds. At this point similarity ceased and diversity began, diversity of such intensity that bitter disputes among the various exponents became an increasing and corrosive factor. In the main, the so-called "utopian" attempts at societary re-creation fell into four principal groupings: (1) communal villages under the direction of a type of religious patriarchate, of which the Rappites and the Shakers[4] form one branch and the authoritarian establishments of John Humphrey Noyes[5] and Adin Ballou[6] the other; (2) the planned community under the leadership of an enlightened philanthropic paternalist, Robert Owen's much-discussed New Harmony[7]

---

ular approach as presented by Victor F. Calverton, *Where Angels Dared to Tread* (Indianapolis, 1941), and Marguerite Young, *Angel in the Forest, A Fairy Tale of Two Utopias* (New York, 1945).

[3] Despite its age (1870) and numerous short-comings, the best comprehensive treatment of this particular phase of American social history remains that by John Humphrey Noyes, *History of American Socialisms.* Although Noyes himself carefully explains that the greater part of this volume is based not on his own work but on that of an earlier researcher, A. J. McDonald, who died before he was able to prepare his voluminous notes on American communities for publication, it is rarely realized or acknowledged by those who have used this work. Of particular value especially for the colonies owing their inspiration to Robert Owen is Arthur E. Bestor, Jr., *Backwoods Utopias: The Sectarian and Owenite Phases of Communitarian Socialism in America 1663-1829* (Philadelphia, 1949).

[4] An interesting insight of the working of Shakerism in the United States can be obtained from Frederick Henry Evans, *Autobiography of a Shaker.* Evans was the brother of George Henry Evans, the prominent advocate of limitation in the holding of land who was active in the reform movement in New York after 1825 and who was associated with the publication of *The Working Man's Advocate* and later *Young America,* the organ of the Land Reform League.

[5] Noyes' own account should be supplemented by that of Robert Allerton Parker, *A Yankee Saint; John Humphrey Noyes and the Oneida Community* (New York, 1935), and Pierrepont Noyes, *My Father's House* (New York, 1937).

[6] Adin Ballou, *History of the Hopedale Community from Its Inception to Its Virtual Submergence in the Hopedale Parish* (Lowell, Mass., 1897). For the philosophy behind the Hopedale settlement see same author, *Practical Christian Socialism: A Conversational Exposition of the True System of Human Society* (New York, 1854), and his later *Primitive Christianity and Its Corruptions* (3 vols. Boston and Lowell, Mass., 1870-1900). Biographical details can be found in William S. Heywood, ed., *Autobiography of Adin Ballou* (Lowell, Mass., 1896).

[7] Lockwood, *The New Harmony Movement,* remains the most thorough study of this episode, although many new materials have appeared since this study was first published over forty-five years ago. John Samuel Duss has become the closest observer of the Rappites as an entity apart from New

being the best example; (3) more broadly based attempts at community of property settlements such as those of Étienne Cabet[8] and Wilhelm Weitling[9]; and (4) and perhaps best-known, the Fourierite joint-stock phalanxes. The latter were most numerous and received most attention from American intellectuals and literary notables during the 1840's.[10] Despite some European influences, this many-sided adventure in socialism is an integral part of nineteenth century American social, economic and cultural history.

From this formidable mass of communal philosophy and actual experimentation there emerged a deviant strain of radical thought. Launched on the old Northwest frontier by an uncompromising descendant of colonial forebears, Josiah Warren, his forthright amalgamation of individualism, fear of the state and economic mutualism has left its mark on the labor and coöperative movements in America and abroad. His dozen and a half published works contributed the essentials for the later fully developed philosophy of individualist anarchism in the United States, as well as making an impression on early American economic and political thought.[11]

Harmony. See his brief monograph *The Harmony Society in Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1937), or the extensive account by the same author, *Harmonists; A Personal History* (Harrisburg, Pa., 1943).

[8] Cabet's own works are indispensable for an understanding of his theory of communal life; see especially *Voyage et Adventures de Lord Villiam Carisdall en Icarie* (Paris, 1840), and *Colonie Icarienne aux États-Unis D'Amerique* (Paris, 1855). See also Sylvester A. Piotrowski, *Étienne Cabet and the Voyage en Icarie, A Study in the History of Social Thought* (Washington, 1935).

[9] Emil Kaler, *Wilhelm Weitling, Seine Agitation und Lehre im geschichtlichen zusammenhange dargestellt* (Socialdemokratische Bibliothek No. XI) (Hottingen-Zurich, 1887); Frederick Converse Clark, "A Neglected Socialist," in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* V(March, 1895), 718-739. See especially the recent work by Carl Wittke, *The Utopian Communist: A Biography of Wilhelm Weitling, Nineteenth Century Reformer* (Baton Rouge, 1950).

[10] The impact of Fourierism on the American literary mind produced a voluminous literature and many chroniclers; the following citations are a selected group of better-known treatments: John T. Codman, *Brook Farm* (New York, 1900); Brooks, *Flowering of New England,* 228-387; Parrington, *Main Currents,* II, 379-426; Clarence L. F. Gohdes, *The Periodicals of American Transcendentalism* (Durham, 1931); Octavius B. Frothingham, *George Ripley* (Boston, 1882); Charles Sotheran, *Horace Greeley and Other Pioneers of American Socialism* (New York, 1915); Redelia Brisbane, *Albert Brisbane, A Mental Biography* (Boston, 1893). A recent re-evaluation of Brisbane is that of Arthur E. Bestor, Jr., "Albert Brisbane, Propagandist for Socialism in the 1840's," in *New York History,* XXVIII (April, 1947), 128-158.

[11] Richard T. Ely, *The Labor Movement in America,* 239-240; Edwin R. A. Seligman, *Essays in Economics,* 143; Mary Ritter Beard, *A Short History of the American Labor Movement,* 140; Commons, *History of Labor,* Introduction, I, 17-19; Saposs, "Colonial and Federal Beginnings," in I, 95-96; Hoagland, "Humanitarianism (1840-1860)," in I, 511-512; Lockwood, *New Harmony Movement,* 14; Noyes, *History of American Socialisms,* 93; Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic* (3rd. ed., 2 vols. New York, 1942), I, 406; Harry Elmer Barnes,

The details concerning Warren's birthplace and parentage are still obscure. Beyond the knowledge of his birth in 1798, practically nothing of an authoritative nature exists.[12] One thing is quite definite, nevertheless; sharing an illustrious colonial name did not mean a similar sharing of the general good fortune of the Warren clan. The year 1819[13] found him making the familiar trek westward and southward down the Ohio which a vast number of Americans continued to make until the midway point in the century was reached, with the principal aim in view of bettering their economic conditions. Warren and an elder brother, George, had shown considerable promise as musicians while still very young, and had become members of the "Old Boston Brigade Band" while still boys of school age.[14] When he and his recently-acquired wife settled in Cincinnati, Josiah continued to earn his livelihood as a musician and teacher of music, an activity he never completely deserted.

The change of locale seems to have sharpened a native inventive

---

The History of Western Civilization (2 vols. New York, 1935), II, 397. Short biographical sketches of Warren appear in Stanley J. Kunitz and Howard Haycraft, *American Authors, 1600-1900,* p. 788, and Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone, eds., *Dictionary of American Biography,* XIX, 483-484. See Bibliographical Essay, Note 28, for other works of importance on Warren.

12. The belief that Warren was directly related to General Joseph Warren, commander of patriot forces at Bunker Hill, appears to be a romanticism unfounded on available sources. The assertion that he was a son of the general is an obvious impossibility, he being born 23 years after the general's death, while Joseph and Richard, the latter's sons, died in 1790 and 1793, respectively, obviating possibility of descent in direct line. The standard Warren family genealogy by John Collins Warren, *Genealogy of Warren With Some Historical Sketches* (Boston, 1854), fails to mention a single person with the given name "Josiah." The day and month of his birth remain unrevealed, as does the exact place of his birth, which may have been either in Brookline or Brighton. See Richard Frothingham, *Life and Times of Joseph Warren* (Boston, 1865), 542, 545-546; Ely, *Labor Movement,* 238; Bailie, *Josiah Warren,* 1-2, Schuster, "Native American Anarchism," 93. The misconception surrounding Warren's birth has been spread about by several other writers, but has been cleared up by recent research. See Appendix II.
13. One of the recent discoveries of an intriguing nature concerning source materials dealing with Warren's life has been a manuscript notebook of Warren's, bearing the letter "D" and containing dated entries from other notebooks lettered from "A" to "J," none of which have been located. The first of these is part of the Warren manuscript collection in the Library of the Workingmen's Institute at New Harmony, Indiana. This notebook contains dates of musical engagements played in and around Boston on January 3 and April 7, 1818. Warren married a girl named Caroline Cutter this same year but the exact date remains as obscure as that of his birth. A daughter, Caroline Maria, was born in Cincinnati, September 12, 1820. See family records in the Workingmen's Institute.
14. George Warren, "Josiah Warren," 1. This brief biographical reminiscence of Warren by his only son is an unpublished manuscript written in Evansville, Indiana in 1893, apparently at the request of Lockwood, who was engaged in preparing his study of the New Harmony communities. See Warren MSS., Workingmen's Institute, George B. Lockwood to George W. Warren, November 10, 1893. Many of the early dates mentioned in this manuscript have proven inaccurate.

genius. Here he began a restless career of invention and innovation in the fields of illumination, printing-press manufacture, stereotyping and musical notation worthy of closer examination in connection with contributions of the Ohio valley to the growing industrial consciousness of the nation. His first contribution was a lamp of revolutionary construction, devised to burn lard instead of the much costlier tallow. It had unusual success, and led to the construction and operation of a factory devoted to its production which prospered, lard oil not yet being known.[15]

It is highly probable that with this background and bent, Josiah Warren might have become one of the early men of wealth in the growing Midwest, had not the personality of Robert Owen[16] intruded and so impressed him with the exciting and disturbing spirit of social reform. Owen's attempt to remake the pattern of mankind's affairs is doubtless an occurrence without comparison in the social history of the new West. One of the few early industrial millionaires, the Welsh textile magnate and philanthropist conceived of a new world on a scale which was lavish far beyond the imagination of his time.

Owen was an environmental determinist.[17] Beginning with the assumption that human nature was a constant, he related all behavior patterns to subsequent reactions to environmental forces. The core of his doctrine was that man's character was a product of exterior stress which he as an individual had no appreciable part in forming. Thus the social system was responsible for its wayward folk, and desirable modes of conduct could be brought about by proper education and supervision. Owen decried the idea of personal responsibility, believing the tenet absurd and productive only of harm; praise and blame on a personal level formed no part of his working social vocabulary.

Having already partially developed his environmental thesis in his model factory town of New Lanark, Scotland,[18] which enjoyed unsurpassed living and working conditions, Owen was determined to put it into operation on an even more striking level, with a new continent as a backdrop. He purchased the colony of Harmony, Indiana from its founders and occupants, a divergent German Lutheran sect known as Rappites. A communal venture with a deeply religious flavor, this group had developed an extensive and strikingly productive estate out of raw wilderness on the Indiana bank of the Wabash River some fifty miles upstream from its juncture with the Ohio.[19] Desiring once more to return to their earlier home in western Pennsylvania, they sold the tract of 30,000 acres of land and the sturdy buildings thereon to Owen for the sum of $150,000.[20] He then renamed it New Harmony and brought in settlers sympathetic to his philosophy and anxious to experience practical success. It was the largest and most promising experiment in environmentalism in the nineteenth century.

---

[15] George Warren, "Josiah Warren," above. This lamp was patented February 28, 1821, but Warren paid little attention to this matter after becoming part of the New Harmony community. *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIX, 483. See also note 80, below.

[16] The standard work on Owen's life is Frank Podmore, *Robert Owen, A Biography* (2 vols. London, 1906). Other works of value are William L. Sargant, *Robert Owen, and His Social Philosophy* (London, 1860); Lloyd Jones, *The Life, Times, and Labours of Robert Owen* (2 vols. London, 1890); G. D. H. Cole, *The Life of Robert Owen* (London, 1930). Owen's autobiography, *The Life of Robert Owen by Himself* (New York edition, 1920), is a valuable source.

[17] A brief, concise statement of Owen's stand on this matter may be found in George Milton Janes, *Who Should Have Wealth and Other Papers* (Milwaukee, 1925), 48. Owen's "Five Fundamental Facts of Human Nature" are reproduced by Podmore, *Robert Owen,* 481-482. Page citations are from the one volume edition (New York, 1910).

[18] Owen was born at Newtown, Montgomeryshire, Wales, on May 14, 1771. He purchased and began operating the mills at New Lanark in 1798. See the brief, approved biographical sketch in his periodical *The New Moral World* (London and Leeds, 1834-1845), I (November 1, 1834), 7. This publication was a continuation of *The Crisis* (London, 1832-1834), which is an ex-

Warren was to know the exhilaration and dejection of the founding and decline of the Owenite interlude at New Harmony before striking out on his own as a social radical. Although unable to hear Owen speak until 1825,[21] he was a member of the first group gathering for the purpose of forming a community of property at the appointed place. By the fall of this same year he was taking active party in the Preliminary Society, and was a participant in the drafting and approving of the first constitution of the New Harmony Community of Equality in February, 1826.[22] His musical training was soon employed; as leader of the

---

tremely important source for the origin and early operations of the renowned Labor Exchanges. Other indispensable periodicals for material concerning Owen are *Robert Owen's Journal* (London, 1850-1852), and *Robert Owen's Millennial Gazette* (London, 1856-1858). The biography by Podmore contains the most adequate bibliography of Owen's works, among the standard treatments, which may be supplemented by National Library of Wales, *A Bibliography of Robert Owen, the Socialist 1771-1858* (Aberystwyth, Wales, 1914).

[19] A brief account stressing the accomplishments of the Rappites at New Harmony is Jacob Schneck and Richard Owen, *The History of New Harmony, Ind.* (Evansville, Ind., 1890). See also Lockwood, *New Harmony Movement,* 19-57; John S. Duss, *George Rapp and His Associates* (Indianapolis, 1914), an account by a specialist in Rappite history.

[20] Podmore, *Robert Owen,* 288; Lockwood, *New Harmony Movement,* 75; Robert Dale Owen, *Threading My Way. Twenty-Seven Years of Autobiography* (New York, 1874), 211. Owen claimed that the purchase price was $140,000. *The New Harmony Gazette,* II (August 15, 1827), 353.

[21] Owen's brief stopover in Cincinnati on his way to New Harmony on December 9, 1824 did not include a speaking engagement there, according to his son William, who was with him on this journey. Joel W. Hiatt, ed., "Diary of William Owen from November 10, 1824, to April 20, 1825," in Indiana Historical Society *Publications,* IV, 61. Owen left New Harmony January 7, 1825, and spoke in Cincinnati on his way to Washington where he addressed the House of Representatives in February and March. Hiatt, ed., "Diary," 97. For further corroboration consult *The Diaries of Donald MacDonald 1824-1826* (Indiana Historical Society *Publications,* vol. XIV) (Indianapolis, 1942), 236, 296.

[22] The name of the community was not decided upon at first, the space being left blank in the preamble. Warren's suggestion that the association adopt

community's band, he was long remembered by the first settlers.[23] By the late winter Warren, his wife and baby daughter were an established family unit of the settlement,[24] and were to remain there for over a year.

The collapse and fragmentation of Owen's brilliant assembly took place much sooner than circumstances had given indication. Failure of its main objective was admitted less than a year and a half after the first confident measures toward central organization had been taken. Numerous reasons have been advanced for this: the absence of Owen at critical times, preoccupation with the externals of organization, and petty strife. More important perhaps was the fact that too much of the tangible and material portion of the venture represented something for which the rank and file of the community felt no attachment, it being the contribution of the leader and not the product of the labor of the group.

Warren made a quick and incisive deduction as to the cause of the debacle which placed him at once in a camp far removed from that in which the faithful Owenites would henceforth gather. He felt that the common property scheme of the New Harmony colony had been instituted by Owen as a means and not as an end; that what had been desired was a social situation in which the interests of the different individuals would coöperate instead of clash one with the other.[25] Even though thirty

---

the title "Commonwealth of New Harmony" was negatived, and William Owen's motion that the space remain blank was carried. The name "New Harmony Community of Equality" was adopted February 5, 1826. See "Minutes of the Convention for Forming a Constitution for the Society of New Harmony held Jan. 25, 1826," February 2, 1826, February 5, 1826. The preamble is reproduced in the minutes for February 1, 1826. In the valuation list prepared at the direction of the select committee on February 8, 1826, Warren and his family were assigned $169 per annum. Warren might have arrived in the spring of 1825. MacDonald reported that several families arrived at New Harmony from Cincinnati between April 13 and April 24, but did not mention Warren specifically. *MacDonald Diaries,* 292.

[23] "When I reached New Harmony, early in 1826, . . . I looked at everything with eyes of enthusiasm. . . . The evening gatherings too, delighted me . . . the weekly concert, with an excellent leader, Josiah Warren, and a performance of music . . . much beyond what I had expected in the backwoods . . ." Robert Dale Owen, "My Experiences of Community Life," in *Atlantic Monthly,* XXXII (September, 1873), 338.

Warren's talents were not all confined to music. The historian Jacob Piatt Dunn asserted, "Josiah Warren, a native of Boston, musician, inventor, and all round genius, was perhaps the brightest mind of the community." *Indiana and Indianans* (5 vols. Chicago, 1919), II, 1089-1090.

[24] The first entry of the Warren family in the account book of the community store is dated March 8, 1826. The family pass books have never been located, and constitute another Warren document of considerable interest for which search continues. For a description of the account books see William Pelham to William Creese Pelham, September 7, 1825, in Harlow Lindley, ed., *Indiana as Seen by Early Travellers* (Indiana Historical *Collections,* vol. III) (Indianapolis, 1916), 371.

[25] Warren MSS. notebook, Labadie Collection, University of Michigan, undated, unpaginated. This is another obscure Warren source, unrelated to the series of notebooks which are apparently in the nature of a diary, containing

years of retrospection upon the experience continued to bring back pleasant memories of what had transpired there, the management of financial and property affairs convinced him of the failure of their mission; "but for property considerations the experiments never would have commenced," was his pithy summation of the situation.[26] Why did an amicable settlement of material affairs fail to become a reality? Warren blamed it upon the submergence of the individual within the confines of the community. The consequences of such a procedure, said Warren, were inevitable. Not only was individual initiative stifled by failure to provide a place within the structure for personal rights and interests beyond the sphere of religious matters, but the elimination of individual property rights resulted in almost total dissipation of responsibility for the occurrence of individual incapacity, failure, and short-comings of other kinds.[27] This was not all. He had noted that the expressions of natural differences of opinion were increasingly looked upon as unfortunate developments and obstacles to success, which had damaging effect on the continuance of courtesy and tolerance. Thus, despite frequent reorganizations, failures became more abrupt and chaos drew nearer. Warren summed up the whole matter in one vigorous outburst:[28]

---

entries through June, 1873, and of which only one has so far been located. See note 13. For mention of the above document elsewhere, consult R. C. Stewart, "The Labadie Labor Collection," in *Michigan Alumnus Quarterly Review,* LIII (May 10, 1947), 250.

[26] *Periodical Letter,* II (July, 1856), 55; Warren, *Practical Details in Equitable Commerce, showing the workings in actual experiment, during a series of years, of the social principles expounded in the works called "Equitable Commerce" by the author of this and "The Science of Society," by Stephen P. Andrews,* 71, cited hereafter as *Practical Details.* A second edition from the same plates was published in 1854. Although this book was not published until 1852, some of the material existed in manuscript for twenty-five years before revision and release under the above title. For the most part, this latter work is the principal source of information concerning the decision to leave New Harmony and the events of the three years following. Any account of Warren's early experiments in social reform is bound to rely upon it heavily.

[27] Warren's views have been summarized adequately in Ely, *Labor Movement,* 238. A fuller treatment by Warren is contained in *Periodical Letter,* 2nd. series, I (December, 1856), 34.

[28] *Periodical Letter,* II (July, 1856), 55-56. Dr. Lyman O. Warren has raised some interesting points in speculating upon the intellectual origins of Josiah Warren's unorthodox thinking. He has called attention to the observation of the famous philosopher George Santayana in his *Persons and Places* that the Brighton Warrens, of whom Josiah was a member, were "a dissentient family." Santayana was a boyhood friend of the uncles of Dr. Warren. The record for independent intransigence appears to go back at least as far as his first American ancestors. John Warren of the *Arbella* is noted in Bond's *History of Watertown* as having been arrested on one occasion for nonattendance at church and for harboring Quakers on another. Further investigation into the family prior to migration to America, itself an act of extraordinary self-assertion and independence, might establish a much longer record of nonconformism. A future biographer of Josiah Warren might well consider the pertinence of this durable tradition.

> It seemed that the difference of opinion, tastes and purposes *increased* just in proportion to the demand for conformity. Two years were worn out in this way; at the end of which, I believe that not more than three persons had the least hope of success. Most of the experimenters left in despair of all reforms, and conservatism felt itself confirmed. We had tried every conceivable form of organization and government. We had a world in miniature. We had enacted the French revolution over again with despairing hearts instead of corpses as a result. . . . It appeared that it was nature's own inherent law of diversity that had conquered us . . . our "united interests" were directly at war with the individualities of persons and circumstances and the instinct of self-preservation . . . and it was evident that just in proportion to the contact of persons or interests, so are concessions and compromises indispensable.

Warren went on from this observation to develop a theory based on an assumption of the variable possession of energy and utility of this energy by different persons. This he never defined with finality, and in keeping with his times, did not include a consideration of the potential impact of irrational motivational drives as a disruption factor. From this observation he was later to develop a philosophy of anarchism of an extreme individualist type which not only was a distinctly American contribution to radical thought but also led to repercussions upon the body of more formal political, economic and social concepts was well.

Although Warren broke sharply with Owen's collective plans for producing the good life, in other respects the cleavage was not so clearly marked. Indeed, his championing of individual sovereignty was to posit a dilemma which was never satisfactorily reconciled. His writings continued to put forth the doctrine of environmentalism,[29] but liberally interleaved with a persistent promotion of belief in free will and individual responsibility which Owen would have categorically dismissed as prime heresy. Conventional society lost Warren forever, despite all this. For almost half a century he followed a course of ceaseless activity, attempting several experiments embracing his own conception of societary reorganization. He never repudiated Owen in

---

29. Six years after leaving New Harmony, Warren wrote, "It is the influence of surrounding circumstances which . . . divided society into rich and poor, which enables some to command and others unable to do otherwise than obey. It is the influence of circumstances which produces different classes in society, and that influence only, which divides men into different political parties and ranges them under different banners of religion. . . . It will be seen that this knowledge warrants us in making a critical examination into our own condition, and all the circumstances which have surrounded us from birth, to see whether they have been . . . such as are most favorable to our happiness, and it teaches us not to reverence or perpetuate bad circumstances simply because we are born under them. . . . This knowledge therefore lays a broad, rational and consistent foundation for unlimited improvement; . . ." *The Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (February 5, 1833), 5. This short-lived Warren periodical continues to be considered the first anarchist publication in existence.

an overt way, his attitude toward the founder of New Harmony remaining one of deep respect to his last days. Many years after the break took place Warren declared:[30]

> I owe it to him that my life is of any value to myself or others. No creature ever heard me utter one word that was disrespectful to Robert Owen of Lanark, and although it is with real pain that I undertake to disconnect his mistakes from that which was true in his glorious career, I have a right to believe that no man would more rejoice at my success than Robert Owen himself.

Despite the theme of hope expressed in the latter part of this commentary, there is no evidence that the Lanark patron of reform paid any attention to the colorful reform career of his New Harmony protege, and his return to New Harmony in the fall of 1844 was marked by the studious avoidance of Warren and the small knot of adherents gathered around him there.

One element of Owen's thought found ready acceptance, in contrast to the lukewarm attitude toward social experimentation. In the hands of Warren and a large number of Warren's followers throughout the remander of the century, the basic economic doctrine of coöperation met no opposition whatever, despite the serious trouble encountered in putting it into action. This was the proposal to exchange all labor employed in the production of goods and services equally, hour for hour, substituting for the state or privately controlled currency based on metallic commodities a circulating medium consisting of "labor notes."[31]

---

[30] Warren MSS., Labadie Collection, undated entry in notebook. It is thought from the arrangement of the material that this notebook was intended as reference at impromptu meetings in private homes, where Warren was a more convincing speaker than he was on the public lecture platform.

Warren's dilemma was a recurrent affair. In an entry dated January 29, 1840 in "Notebook D," entitled "Natural Liberty Coexistent with Social Order; New Social Arrangements Intended to Gradually Restore the Natural Liberty of Mankind," he wrote, "These proceedings are conducted with a watchful and strict regard to the laws of our Nature, so ably developed by Robert Owen . . ." This latter clause was later stricken out and the words "particularly its Individualities" inserted, an obvious concession to his desire to find a middle ground between determinism and individualism at least satisfactory to himself. See also his appraisal of Owen in *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (April 5, 1833), 15-16.

[31] The idea of paper money representing a certain amount of labor rather than a certain precious commodity was held in common and developed separately by several radical economic thinkers in the first half of the nineteenth century as well. Besides Owen in England, similar conceptions on a different scale can be found in the writings of John Gray, *A Lecture on Human Happiness* (London, 1825); William Thompson, *An Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth Most Conducive to Human Happiness* (London, 1824; another edition, 1850); John Francis Bray, *Labour's Wrongs and Labour's Remedy; or, the Age of Might and the Age of Right* (Leeds, 1839). Johann Karl Rodbertus in Germany and Pierre Joseph Proudhon in France evolved similar monetary substitutions. Short summaries of their theories can be found in Edward C. K. Gonner, *The Social Philosophy of Rodbertus*

These were simply bills issued in the form of currency, limited in issue and signed by the issuer, promising to furnish labor at specified occupations or activities for specific periods, in exchange for services desired of and rendered by another. These were to be issued on the basis of hours of labor or fractions of hours, depending upon the amount of another's labor consumed.

Owen had been mulling over the labor theory of value before coming to America. His four *Essays on the Formation of Human Character,* published in New Lanark in 1812-1813,[32] contained indications of his whole-hearted conversion to this doctrine. The contention that the true price of a thing is the amount of labor expended in its production had been espoused by political economists generations before Adam Smith,[33] although Smith had stated it in classic form in 1776. Owen's labor note idea was a ground-breaker in the direction of practical realization of this idea, and this he also had fully developed in his own mind before reaching New Harmony.[34]

Warren became a permanent convert to this new system, propagandizing for its adoption both verbally and through practical attempts for almost forty-five years. Its operation was never realized at New

---

(London, 1899); Dennis W. Brogan, *Proudhon* (London, 1934); Henry Cohen, *Proudhon's Solution of the Social Problem* (New York, 1927). The simplicity of application of this idea by Warren is unique during a time confined almost entirely to theorizing about this matter.

[32] These were later published as a bound collection under this title. (Manchester, Eng. 1837). A contemporary edition appeared in London in 1813 under the title *A New View of Society; or, Essays on the Principle of the Formation of the Human Character,* with separate pagination.

[33] Consult Edger A. J. Johnson, *Predecessors of Adam Smith* (New York, 1937), Chapters XII-XIII, for a development of the background of the labor cost theory. Whether Warren was acquainted with the writings of Adam Smith is not known but unlikely. However Proudhon, developing a similar line of thought to Warren in a French environment, mentioned Smith, along with the Bible and Hegel as his three principal sources of inspiration. Zenker, *Anarchism,* 35.

[34] The following extract from the diary of William Owen, referring to his father's visit in Kentucky on the way to New Harmony in the late fall of 1824, is of great interest in the effort to assign proper credit for the labor note idea: "We walked through the town-Mayesville [sic] and found a good front and a tolerable second street. Hunter and my father bought mits and *Mr. Owen had a bantering conve[r]sation with the storekeeper regarding money and labor notes.* He told us that a gallon of whisky, which will make twelve individuals quite drunk, can be bought for 12½ cents." Hiatt, ed., "Diary of William Owen," 61. Italics are the present writer's.

Warren's location of credit is unequivocal; "Mr. Owen thought he was doing me a piece of courteous justice when he said at a public meeting in London, that "he got his ideas from me"; I appreciate the intention and honor him for his candor; but the above . . . are no part of any movement ever conducted or proposed by me. The idea of labor notes was suggested by Robert Owen in 1826 as a medium of exchange between Communities at New Harmony." *Peaceful Revolutionist,* II (May, 1848), 6, 14. For other examples where Warren gave full credit to Owen see *Practical Details,* 15-16; *The Quarterly Letter. Devoted Mainly to Showing the Practical Applications and Progress of Equity,* I, 2, cited hereafter as *Quarterly Letter.*

Harmony, so Josiah Warren became the first person to employ the device in everyday economic intercourse. His Cincinnati Time Store of 1827-1830 became the first scientific experiment in coöperative economy in modern history,[35] despite its limited objectives as such, as well as its obscurity resulting from the modest unsophisticated structure employed and the stark utilitarianism which prevailed during its existence.

While Warren was forming his own philosophy, rejecting part of Owen's convictions and accepting another part, his New Harmony experiences as a member of the original Community of Equality were producing other repercussions. His observation of human differences, among other things, shattered his faith in the ideal of economic equality.[36] Basing his conclusions on the assumption that different persons put differing amounts of energy and time toward the accomplishment of various ends, and satisfied with the motivational drives which "enlightened self-interest" might supply, he proposed the substitution of the ideal of equal opportunities to the access to land, raw materials and credit. Equal opportunities being provided, individual differences and completely free competition would gradually work toward the establishment of an equitable society,[37] in which returns would be measured by the amount of work performed, both quantitatively and qualitatively. To Warren the striving for equity was the highest possible goal of human effort.

Warren's complete program was a cumulative affair which did not receive definitive statement for almost twenty years.[38] A part of this period of growth was his growing disregard for constituted authority, partially a product of attachment to a number of attitudes which convinced him that institutional government was a superfluous part of human society. His primary source of dissatisfaction with what he called the "communistic experiments" in New Harmony was the combination of interests. This combination required, as he saw it, a government based on authority and demanding obedience which resulted in the death of individual liberty.[39] The alternative which he proposed and crusaded for was a system based on voluntary coöperation, but at no

---

35. John R. Commons and Associates, *A Documentary History of Industrial Society,* V, 79.
36. *Practical Details,* 75.
37. It should be remembered that Warren's continual use of the term "equitable commerce" occurred with the understanding that the word "commerce" was being used in its overall sense as the sum total of human activities and not merely economic considerations alone. There is no doubt that Warren believed that major reforms in the economic sphere were the most important, nevertheless.
38. The first systematic and extended arrangement of Warren's convictions was his *Equitable Commerce: a new developement* [sic] *of principles for the harmonious adjustment and regulation of the pecuniary, intellectual and moral intercourse of mankind, proposed as elements of New Society* (New Harmony, Ind., 1846), hereafter cited as *Equitable Commerce.*
39. Ely, *Labor Movement,* 238; Warren, *Practical Details,* 13.

place rising above any individual within its structure; "the sovereignty of the individual" had to be preserved at all costs. This matter he considered more important than any artificial arrangement of individuals which demanded the fidelity of all. There was no compensation which could equate the sacrifice of this principle of individuality.[40] There is a frontier flavor to his own blunt declaration of individualist war upon the hobbling tendencies of institutionalism which still commands attention:[41]

> Society must be so converted as to preserve the SOVEREIGNTY OF EVERY INDIVIDUAL inviolate. That it must avoid all combinations and connections of persons and interests, and all other arrangements which will not leave every individual at all times at liberty to dispose of his or her person, and time, and property in any manner in which his or her feelings or judgment may dictate, WITHOUT INVOLVING THE PERSONS OR INTERESTS OF OTHERS.

Using this concept of individualism, then it appeared logical to him that interests, responsibilities and actions all had to be confined to this level.[42]

From this point he carried the analysis into the familiar area which had created the snag at New Harmony, property matters. Assuming that the factors of production were the same for all men, Warren deduced that under such circumstances, sovereignty over one's property was therefore restricted to control over the entire production or material results of one's own labor and nothing more. Such a goal might be rather easily attained in a Crusoe economy, he conceded, wherein a single individual supplied all his own needs. But there already existed a division of labor which considerably complicated the problem of exchange. It would therefore require a different solution to continue to guarantee each individual a total amount of income, however deviously contrived, equal to the product of his original energy expenditure in labor. Anarchist economic thought has continued to express grave concern at this point, holding that this is the original area of injury and discrimination within society. Holding that wealth can be obtained in only two fundamental ways, either by producing it or by taking it from its producer, they maintain that one of these latter actions is involved in all inequitable exchanges.

To solve this problem Warren brought forth the labor exchange idea which he had absorbed from Owen and which remained firmly planted in his mind. This became his initial action in the effort to promote adoption of a satisfactory method of effecting equitable exchanges, paying little attention to the complexities which had grown upon this branch of human relations through centuries of changing ethical approaches. Nevertheless, an economy based on the exchange of equivalents, or as he termed it, "labor for labor," became the basis for the new society he projected. His formula therefore rejected the idea of paying for such goods of the earth as were not the product of human labor.[43] Unlike later adherents to native anarchism, Warren continued to think land a fit subject for sale, an obvious inconsistency. On other matters, which he occasionally referred to as "spontaneous fruits of nature," the raw materials derived from labor on the land, he held that such were no more fit subjects for monopoly and sale than sunshine or air.

---

[40] An admirable summation of Warren's philosophy of individualism is that of Thomas Low Nichols, *Forty Years of American Life,* II, 39. Nichols' relations with Warren and the anarchists at "Modern Times" will be found in Chapter III.

[41] Warren, *Practical Details,* 13. Capitalized portions are Warren's.

[42] *Practical Details,* above.

As regards compensation, Warren saw nothing fundamentally wrong with the original Owenite proposal to exchange labor time on an equal hour-for-hour basis. One of the perennial stumbling blocks to the realization of the labor cost theory, the problem of determining the relative intensities and production of the hour's work being exchanged, did bother him somewhat. But he assumed that the principle of individual sovereignty being preserved at all times, each individual would make what he considered the necessary exceptions to the hour-for-hour yardstick without causing any noticeable disaffection among those involved in the labor exchange group.[44]

Josiah Warren was no aimless manipulator of theories. All his life he manifested a tireless interest in proof through demonstration. Scarcely had the reluctant admission of failure in Indiana appeared in the *New Harmony Gazette* in May 1827, when Warren gathered his family, his scant goods and savings together and returned to Cincinnati, anxious to try out his economic scheme in an actual social situation. He decided that the best means of effecting proof of the workability of his views was through the operation of a retail store, observing that such a trial was bound to affect a wide variety of persons, and its operations would thus become a type of laboratory exhibit.[45]

The venture was carefully planned. Warren had no intention of continuing in the capacity of storekeeper if what he thought proved to be successful. His intention was to close the store abruptly and begin a model village at once on the outskirts of Cincinnati. The residents he hoped to recruit from among the more enthusiastic of the group of coöperators. This was to be done as quietly as possible, publicity being kept to a bare minimum. His strategy involved the practical demonstration of every element of non-coercive equity on the autonomous local community level in such a manner as to leave no doubt as to their value and practicability. Following the explanation of the manner in which the process had been accomplished, Warren believed that a rapid growth of mutualist villages would take place.[46] Like Robert Owen, he anticipated great things for the betterment of mankind, although the structure he contemplated was far less complex.

---

[43] *Practical Details,* 14.

[44] *Practical Details,* above.

[45] On his return to Cincinnati, Warren leased the tract of land bounded by Elm, John, Fifth and Ninth Streets from Nicholas Longworth for 99 years. His return of the lease to Longworth is anomalous, in view of the fact that he still conceived of land as a commodity and subject to purchase and sale. The loss of this tract as a bargaining weapon must have been keenly felt at the time consideration of a colony site was taking place. See George Warren, "Josiah Warren," 2, for a summary of this curious incident.

Fifty years after its re-possession by Longworth, this area, comprising 12 blocks of the northwestern part of the present city of Cincinnati and including the City Hall, was appraised at $2,000,000. Alfred N. Chandler, *Land Title Origins; A Tale of Force and Fraud,* 479. See also Clara Longworth de Chambrun, *The Making of Nicholas Longworth* (New York, 1933).

Thus the anarchist vision of a world composed of autonomous local communities, in which individuality would be one sacred principle and economic life regulated by the mutual exchange of goods and services on a cost basis, found its expression on the trans-Allegheny frontier two decades before similar European conceptions made their appearance. Furthermore, while the present-day modified coöperative movement looks to Rochdale, England and the earlier London Labor Exchanges, the first venture in coöperative marketing had an uncontestably American setting, predating either of these more widely known English events and in some respects providing the inspiration for them.[47]

Warren's store had a modest beginning, and actually was only a partially-controlled experiment. This is generally true in most similar situations, involving a degree of leaning upon the existing order for two principal reasons: (1) initial weakness, and (2) the desire to make the venture as painless a transition from the familiar as possible. Warren had both in mind. Despite his contempt for the conventional method of doing business by functioning within a money economy, he was compelled to resort to a partial dependence upon such himself to make a start. He was not sure that his venture would prove successful; in fact he had promised himself that should his plan of coöperation on the labor for labor principle show serious flaws or insuperable circumstances, his association with what he termed "systematic reforms" was to be concluded. It is probably because of this half-hidden fear of failure that he made no rash claims nor engaged in the circulating of any type of propectus.

---

[46] *Practical Details,* 14.

[47] The earliest proposal for the employment of labor notes in England similar to those which enjoyed widespread use in Warren's Cincinnati store is that of the Brighton Co-Operative Benevolent Fund Association, in November, 1827, six months after their successful introduction in the Ohio pioneer venture. The operation of the store and the determination of the value of the labor notes differed slightly from that already functioning in America. One of the plates from which the English labor notes were printed is in the collection of the Workingmen's Institute. See the description of the English plan in Podmore, *Robert Owen,* 386, quoting from the *Cooperative Magazine* of November, 1827.

The original stock of the store consisted of three hundred dollars' worth of groceries and dry goods which were in greatest demand.[48] Warren posted the bills of purchase within view of all potential customers, that all might see what had originally been paid for the goods on sale. Accompanying them was a notice stating that the cost price would be charged plus a seven per cent mark-up[49] to pay what he called "contingent expenses." This constituted the first part of the transaction. He made it plain that no element of the cash price consisted of his profit or return as storekeeper. The customer was first to pay this cost price, plus the seven per cent, which was to defray shipping cost and general overhead of the store. But for the portion which represented his own labor, Warren merely required the customer to present him with a labor note. This note promised to repay an equal amount of time, in the customer's occupation, to the storekeeper, as he had consumed of the storekeeper's time in effecting the transfer of the merchandise.[50] The principal distinction between Warren's store and those of his neighbors was this simple feature, the separation of the merchant's compensation from the cost of the goods sold.

Often asked by people who failed to understand what he was trying to do, why he did not charge a blanket percentage to cover the entire matter of costs and profit, Warren patiently explained that failure to disconnect the two operations would destroy the principle he was trying to illustrate. No percentage could be accurately assigned to serve either the seller's or the buyer's interest; no particular relation existed between the profit and the labor expended in production of the article vended. Thus for instance twenty percent profit on needles would soon result in the storekeeper's ruination, while the same percentage on broadcloth would net him a return of probably two dollars for a scant ten minutes work, obviously inequitable. A storekeeper, he went on, might buy and sell one barrel or a hundred barrels of flour in the same time; thus the correct basis upon which he should be paid was solely the amount of time expended in conducting the transaction.[51]

Warren was convinced that nothing was superior to the direct exchange of commodities and services; if agreement as to labor content existed, it was preferable to any system involving elements of confidence and risk, which he was convinced the use of currency necessarily

---

48. *Quarterly Letter,* I, 6.
49. *Quarterly Letter,* I, above. The amount charged to pay this item was a variable in Warren's plan. By the fifth month of the first year the amount added to original cost had been reduced to four per cent. Twenty years later he recommended adding six per cent to the original cost. *Practical Details,* 22; *Equitable Commerce,* 61.
50. *Practical Details,* 15.
51. *Practical Details,* 29.

provoked.[52] Realizing that specialization and diversity of tastes made this only a partial solution to the continual problem of exchange, the adoption of the labor note paper bills served the function of completing all exchanges not available to settlement by direct exchange. There was a difference in the application of this device by Warren as compared to its original purpose as conceived by Owen. Where the latter had intended it as a means of effecting transactions among the different communities at New Harmony, the former reduced the scope to the local function of a limited currency, but valid among all those who engaged in any part of the business at the time store.

The name "time store" was a popular designation, not an original appellation of Warren's, and had come into general use by the end of the third month of the store's existence. The circumstances responsible for this have aroused the interest and curiosity of several commentators, but Warren's own explanation is the clearest.[53]

> A clock was in plain sight to measure the time of the tender in delivering the goods which was considered one-half of the labor, and purchasing, etc., the other half. An index resembling the face of a clock was fixed just below it; and when the tender commenced to deliver goods, he was to set the index to correspond to the clock; the index would stand still while the clock would run on, and a comparison of the two would show how much time had been employed.

This was an innovation. It was to the interest of the customer to take up as little of the storekeeper's time as possible, since time was one of the elements in the price settlement. Thus wrangling and higgling over prices, which Warren considered a particularly degrading feature of ordinary commerce, was eliminated in time store operations, a matter of considerable significance at a time when such functions were an almost fundamental part of merchandising. Transactions were expedited by the open display of goods and prominence of list prices, another unprecedented feature.[54]

It is interesting to note that before the store was terminated, Warren succeeded in reducing the commerce in such staples as flour, meal, beans, beef, pork and shoes to a modified labor exchange level. A set of actual labor prices based on an average estimate of the labor cost of production of each of these commodities evolved, which was posted in the store, and these changed from time to time as labor estimates fluctuated. The partial realization of an economy resting exclusively on exchange of labor notes thus took place independent of the use of legal currency.[55]

---

[52] *The Peaceful Revolutionist*, I (February 5, 1833), 6. Warren skirted barter economy but briefly, even though he saw nothing particularly invidious about its operation if the need of either party involved did not constitute a margin sufficiently noticeable to promote exploitation one by the other.

[53] *Quarterly Letter*, I, 6.

[54] Warren, *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity and the Last Ground of Hope for Mankind. Being the Results and Conclusions of Thirty-nine Years' Laborious Study and Experiments in Civilization as it is, and in Different Enterprises for Reconstruction*, 88, hereafter cited as *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity; Practical Details*, 15.

Warren's unpretentious establishment opened its doors on May 18, 1827 and after a faltering start produced results which he found highly gratifying.[56] The failure of New Harmony had become common knowledge in Cincinnati by the time Warren expressed his determination to begin his labor exchange store, and his friends begged him to refrain from additional attempts at reform. The promise of financial support in commencing a conventional business venture was of no avail. Nor was he inhibited by denunciations of his plan as "utopian" or "visionary," or as just one more of the numerous tricks to aid speculating or swindling which were all too common in the port towns along the water route to New Orleans. Despite all the discouraging factors, the time store began operations, and at the end of three months had resulted in making an impression in the retail trade of the area which has since drawn the attention of students of early American economic radicalism.

Warren's methods of doing business were adopted by a neighboring merchant, while he declared that the new methods permitted him to sell as much merchandise in an hour as normally was retailed in a day. This increased activity forced him to close part of the day to rest and to furnish information as to how the labor exchange store functioned. There was a mixed reception to the new shop. Some, who considered the principles equitable, thought them a thing of the future. Others circulated rumors that Warren was an accomplice of big merchants, helping them dispose of their damaged and inferior stocks of goods. One opponent, still remembering New Harmony and the suspicion it had aroused among conservative folk, asserted that Warren was an agent of Robert Owen and had been commissioned to engage in a plot to undermine the United States.[57] No one seemed to realize that Warren's system was a direct blow at the money economy and the power that such a system had in determining the nature of production and the incidence of distribution. The time store founder was not to feel the full impact of a large-scale whispering campaign for some time in the future, not until the time of the founding of the much-discussed individualist colony on Long Island.

---

[55] Warren MSS., Labadie Collection, "A Scrap of History," undated and unpaginated. This brief manuscript appears to be part of another attempted publication, but a comparison with his published works indicates that it remained unused.

[56] The first customer in the time store was Warren's brother, according to Warren's account. He recalled prevailing upon him to make the first purchase to start the experiment, "desperate with disappointment and chagrin" at the failure of three friends to make promised transactions. Warren, *Practical Details,* 17-18. Two weeks after the Time Store opened, the *Western Tiller* of Cincinnati began publication of a series of eight dispatches, which ran from June 1 through July 27, written by "A Late Member of New Harmony," and addressed "To the Friends of the Social System," which, based on the criteria of internal criticism, must be attributed to Warren. These essays are not only prepared in his peculiar style, but amount to a trial run of some of the ideas to be found later in *Equitable Commerce.*

[57] *Practical Details,* 24; *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (April 5, 1833), 15.

Warren, in his anxiety to extend the labor exchange method in as many ways as possible, gave music lessons in the evenings to young men who understood the operation of the plan and agreed to enter as participants. He and a group of his mutual customers succeeded in securing a teacher for their children who also accepted compensation in labor notes. In 1829 he asserted that three physicians had already purchased goods on these same principles,[58] promising professional services on demand. An agnostic, he took pleasure in telling at a later time of an influential Methodist convert to the time store principles who had interrupted an argument about a point of faith and charity with the following observation: "Well, brothers, people have been disputing for eighteen hundred years about what is true Christianity. Now, if you will go down to the corner of Fifth and Elm Streets, you will see it in operation for the first time in the world."[59]

Warren borrowed money to aid in the development of the store in its early days, but insisted on giving the lenders notes which were payable on demand.[60] He never explained whether such payments had ever been requested or whether he had ever agreed to pay interest, or how immediate payment was possible if the sum obtained through loan had been invested in fixed capital by the time demand for its return had been made. There is no doubt, however, that he received the necessary backing, in view of the prolonged period of operations.

Warren was opposed to enlarging the scope of his activities. He stressed continually that he was not attempting to put retail storekeepers out of business but trying to demonstrate principles of mutualism. He did double the capacity of the original store before the end of the first year,[61] employing the labor of seven carpenters on the familiar exchange procedure; still he insisted on keeping the business on the same simple relationship between keeper and customer and never expanded to the extent of hiring clerks. This action would have been in the nature of a partnership under his conception of the plan, and such combination of interests was diametrically opposed to the principle of individuality which he unequivocally professed.

---

[58] *Practical Details,* 22, 25, 31.

[59] This was Richard Folger, who with John Pickering, were among the earliest supporters of equity. Pickering later broke with Warren at the time of the commencement of "Utopia," some twenty years later. *Practical Details,* 33; *Periodical Letter,* I, 2nd. series, supplement 2, p. 2; *Peaceful Revolutionist,* II (May, 1848), 13-15.

[60] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (February 5, 1833), 6.

[61] See Warren's letter to the *Mechanic's Free Press* (Philadelphia, 1827-1831), May 10, 1828, p. 2, quoted in Commons, *Documentary History,* V, 133-137.

The introduction of still another aspect of labor exchange opened his eyes to other inequalities in the economic system which he believed called for reparation. This was what he called the "report of demand." A large sheet of paper was posted on one wall of the store on which those with particular needs made them known, and those with labor and services available for exchange stated the nature of their particular ability or capacity. At the same time he posted a list of commodities for which he would exchange the same, in an attempt to produce a "leveling" of supply.[62] Warren's conception of the terms "supply" and "demand" had little relation to their use in economic terminology of the present day. In his simple system, the declared desire to have a given object constituted "demand" for it, and no relation whatever to the possession of ability to pay on the basis of theoretical graduated price curves, in a money economy. He was convinced that existing economic relationships were exactly reversed in operation, to that demanded by distributive justice. The only way to bring about equity was to adapt supply to what he called "demand," and thus eliminate the occasion for speculation in human need.

The great number of requests for employment in unwanted occupations distressed him considerably, as did the observation that the labor return of children and women was artificially depressed below the level existing among adult men engaged in similar activities. This led to an investigation and condemnation of the apprentice system,[63] which he called an "obsolete barbarity," a deliberate and artificial restriction of employment which curtailed demand for many services and products. Thus began a full-scale campaign to spread information about all types of skills, a matter of vital concern at a time previous to the widespread adoption of automatic machinery. Warren reasoned that the cost-basis economy required the production of all goods at the lowest possible labor cost. This could only be accomplished by the employment of each in the activity he could do best, and therefore cheapest, from the point of view of labor time involved. It was at this time also that he observed another harrassing element in the labor exchange operation. This was the problem of determining intensity of relative hours of labor, further complicated by the fact that the most repulsive types of labor were generally the poorest paid. This matter he wrestled with for the remainder of his life, and was never able to satisfy himself as to the best method of solution.

Warren's activities in marketing spread over a wide range. He sold almost any product or article which he thought would demonstrate his theory. In all transactions, he attempted a drastic underselling[64] of his competitors to provide the greatest possible contrast between the profit system and the coöperative system. This occasionally involved practices which were not strictly in accordance with equity, such as purchases in wholesale lots, often at public auctions.[65] Such were sacrifices and not exchanges of equivalents. He justified this action by asserting that other retailers bought as much as he, but failed to pass on the saving to their patrons.

---

[62] *Practical Details,* 16; *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (February 5, 1833), 7.
[63] *Practical Details,* 27, 29.
[64] Compare prices reported by Warren in 1827 in *Practical Details,* 21, 23, 27.

The Cincinnati Time Store was finally liquidated in May, 1830.[66] Warren had long been satisfied that his plan was sound and that he had succeeded in regulating his business by principles without utilizing what he called "the customary machinery of organization," or the "erection of any power over the individual." In fact, he thought that this had been proven in the first six months.[67] The original intent to start communities based on such principles he found more difficult to promote than expected. As early as November, 1827, he had contemplated beginning on a holding of 1500 acres of land in Logan County, Ohio, which had been offered for the purpose by an enthusiast named Samuel Hyde Saunders.[68] Nothing was done at this time, nor even a year later when he considered moving outside the city and forming a model village.

A third and final decision to begin a village was made in April, 1829. Despite the hundreds of customers who had made purchases in the time store,[69] all involving the acceptance and utility of labor notes, Warren ruefully recalled that only four people[70] were ready to take part in this adventure. Warren learned, as had Owen before him, that the inertia of the status quo was a formidable antagonist to such a sweeping reorganization of human affairs as he entertained. He was too practical to think that such a plan as he proposed could succeed if supported only by the poor, the needy, and others at the bottom of the economic ladder, even though it was one of the principal reasons for starting in the first place, to eliminate the perpetuation of this by-product of what he called "legalized cannibalism." He remarked that hundreds were interested in his proposition who were too poor to afford the loss of the month's income which removing and changing positions would occasion. Others had different objections. Some feared inability to obtain employment under the new conditions. Others did not look favorably upon the equitable compensation of women and children or the proposal to teach the secrets of carefully guarded trades in a few days or weeks. Those with means admitted in private conversations the worth of some of his proposals yet abstained entirely from offering assistance.

---

[65] The following is a representative example: "Bought three barrels of rice at Haydn & Co's. auction at 1½ cents a pound, and am selling it out at 1¾, while the customary price for so good an article has uniformly been 8 cents a pound; people are coming from all directions to get it . . ." *Practical Details,* 26.

[66] This has been a controversial point among interested observers, although Warren leaves no doubt about the matter. For confirmation of the three year duration see *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (February 5, 1833), 7; *The Herald of Equity,* I (February, 1841), 6.

[67] *Practical Details,* 40.

[68] *Practical Details,* 23. Saunders later wrote for the *Free Enquirer* under the pseudonym "Philanthropos." *Free Enquirer,* I, new series, (December 31, 1829), 79; *Periodical Letter,* I, 2nd. series, (January, 1858), 98-101.

[69] Ely stated that Warren did a total business of $150,000 during the operation of the time store, but Warren's contemporary accounts were much more modest than this. In March, 1829 he revealed that he had never utilized more than $4,000 in the proceedings up to that time, and that he had retailed a total of about $30,000 worth of goods. Warren had actually begun the process of liquidation of the store at this time, but shortly revived it again. It is unlikely that his volume quintupled in the next year of operations. Ely, *Labor Movement,* 239; *Practical Details,* 31-32.

[70] *Practical Details,* 41.

Warren was aware of criticism of his social ideas on the basis of their being ahead of their time, as well as their assumed impracticability due to the lack of persons capable of living on such an advanced and enlightened level. What he did not realize, apparently, was the reluctance with which people were willing to part with present security, no matter how faint the degree, in exchange for the unknown, no matter how promising. Willingness to participate in such a proposal as he advocated on the limited scale of a store was a far different matter from the formidable design to erect a new structure of society in a raw wilderness, without any of the reassuring comforts of familiar institutions or material standards to which they had already become accustomed and conditioned. The enthusiasm which he encountered while operating his store was still too closely tied to the hope of individual gain from some part of the transaction in the minds of many of the participants. Hardy spirits always willing to leave the confines of the community usually were motivated in a similar manner, an attitude toward which Warren was thoroughly opposed. The distaste for this selfish type of individualism remained with him from the time of the community experiences at New Harmony, and he never was able to tolerate it thereafter. Under the Warrenite approach, economic prominence was obtained under the labor for labor plan through superior utilization of the individual's own energy, not through the manipulation of various factors of the economy to produce an income unearned by actual labor.

Warren felt at the time that those who participated in his time store still lacked the capacity to understand the nature of the proposals the way he had explained them.[71] Many years later, however, he became convinced that, looking back on the wreckage of several community attempts, failure had been due more to the planned efforts of an element among the business community, which he claimed had everywhere created difficulties and placed obstacles in the way of success of his non-profit community projection.[72] In spite of the mounting gloom occasioned by the unresponsiveness of his former coöperators to the call to form a village, the plan was persevered in, and the land wa, selected upon which to move, in the spring of 1829.[73]

---

[71] *Practical Details,* 42.

[72] *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 107-108.

At this point the strange interlude of Warren's relations with Robert Dale Owen[74] and Frances Wright[75] occurred. Owen, the gifted son of the New Harmony patron, and the brilliant Scotswoman, champion of a dozen unpopular causes ranging from Negro equality to anti-clericalism, had moved the center of operations of the intellectual radical movement associated with New Harmony from Indiana to New York City. There they had renewed publication of the celebrated community newsorgan, *The New Harmony Gazette,*[76] under the name *The Free Enquirer,* devoting most of the space now to the propagation of the general sentiments of freethought, with generous portions of acrimonious controversy with adherents of various brands of orthodoxy as a special feature. Althought more concerned with their protracted joust with biblical fundamentalists, and in particular, the wave of emotional revivalism then sweeping through some elements of Protestantism, the two young liberals retained a sympathetic interest in all attempts at community organization. This was understandable, since most of this activity during this period was primarily a backwash of the parent essay at New Harmony.

The Ohio activities of Josiah Warren had attracted the attention of the land and labor reform press of New York City,[77] where slums were already a problem, and depressed segments of the population a feature of the urban social structure. It is not unusual, then, to find the editors of *The Free Enquirer* becoming concerned to the point of proposing collaboration in achieving the aims of Warren's non-political scheme for alleviating the evidences of economic distress which had come to his attention during the few years of his reform career.

---

[73] *Practical Details,* 43.

[74] The fullest work on the most famous of Owen's sons is Richard W. Leopold, *Robert Dale Owen, A Biography* (Cambridge, Mass., 1940). This stresses his later life as an Indiana political figure and convert to spiritualism and largely dismisses his activities as a reformer and freethinker. For another treatment with differing interpretations see Elinor Pancoast and Anne E. Lincoln, *The Incorrigible Idealist, Robert Dale Owen in America* (Bloomington, Ind., 1940).

[75] The most recent work of extensive character is the sympathetic study by Alice J. G. Perkins and Theresa Wolfson, *Frances Wright, Free Enquirer* (New York, 1939). Of considerable use also is William R. Waterman, *Frances Wright* (Columbia University *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law,* vol. CXV, no. 1) (New York, 1924).

[76] A valuable account of this journal may be found in Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines 1741-1850* (Cambridge, Mass., 1939), 536-538.

[77] This was also true of Philadelphia, where *The Mechanic's Free Press* had already made Warren's views known to the workingmen of the city. Three stores involving Warren's plan had begun operating in this city before the Cincinnati store completed its second year. *Mechanic's Free Press,* May 17, September 20, 1828; March 14, 1829.

Owen prevailed upon Warren to postpone the beginning of his community in Ohio in favor of a similar beginning in the vicinity of New York. This was made to appear extremely attractive through the promise of considerable financial and material support already at the former's bidding. Owen, as had his father, had in mind a much larger unit than Warren. This was apparently to be publicized through a press campaign, intending no doubt to include the pages of the *Free Enquirer,* in a broad program of propaganda to advertise its potential advantages.[78] Dazzled by this offer, Warren abandoned the proposed movement to the outskirts of Cincinnati, and thus the decision came about to continue the time store into a third year.

Owen's existing business precluded the immediate start of the New York village, and what was intended to be a temprary lull dragged on. Thus the time store celebrated a third anniversary before Warren liquidated the remaining stock and began the momentous journey to New York, anticipating memorable results. But still another delay intervened; Owen was called to Europe and the plans languished.[79] Yet there still remained a strong spirit of affirmation of the previous support of Warren on his part and that of Fanny Wright as well.[80] *The Free Enquirer* continued to express confidence in the eventual success of a Warrenite colony, and Warren himself was still hopeful, but the summer found him somewhat subdued. In mid-July he addressed a communication to his Cincinnati associates, confessing that nothing tangible had been accomplished, but asserting that the call to begin practical operations would come at an early date.[81]

---

78. *Practical Details,* 43.
79. Bailie, *Josiah Warren,* 25.
80. Waterman notes the influence of Warren in Frances Wright's proposed reconstruction of society. *Frances Wright,* 251. When the two first became acquainted is uncertain; no evidence exists to support the contention that their association dates from New Harmony days, as Warren undoubtedly left the colony before Fanny's residence was established. However, they had begun exchanging ideas in Cincinnati before she left for New York. Shortly before Warren undertook his own trip to the East, she recalled being at his home in Cincinnati in 1828, the occasion for this comment being the appearance of a lamp in the New York scene which she claimed was a theft of the earlier one patented by Warren in 1821. *The Free Enquirer,* II (May 22, 1830), 240. See also her favorable sketch of Warren and his accomplishments in *The Free Enquirer,* II (October 23, 1830), 412. It is interesting to observe that this comment, somewhat uncritical and ignorant of several facts concerning the Warren venture, was written after he had left New York and returned to the West. There is no indication that Robert Dale Owen had lost any confidence in the eventual success of a coöperative village from the spirit of this communication.
81. Warren's short notice was headed "To the Friends of the Equal Exchange of Labor in the West" and was dated July 4, 1830. *The Free Enquirer,* II (July 17, 1830), 301-302.

CHAPTER II

Spring Hill, Tuscarawas and the New Harmony Interlude

The attempt to start a mutualist community in New York in 1830 died while still being contemplated. Robert Dale Owen was delayed in returning from England by the death of a relative, and activity failed to occur in his absence, since the movement had been predicated on aid from him. "All hope from that quarter vanished," Warren commented cryptically.[1] Why Owen did not support this unusual and exciting social adventure at a later time continues to be obscure. He never explained his loss of interest, and Warren's silence as to the particulars was typical of his refusal to conduct extended post-mortems upon experiencing rebuffs and failures, which grew in number from this time onward.[2] It is true that he was somewhat disappointed in his Cincinnati friends, who interpreted the sudden halt as the result of the realization of the inadvisability of the village as a mechanism for making "profits." The lack of faith was a source of irritation, but the loss of support was deemed preferable to the risk of inaccurate printing of his communications by the newspapers. Distrust of the public press became one of Warren's lifetime obsessions, but he continued to explain his economic views in the *Free Enquirer*. He now said, for the first time, that production should be regulated by demand in the equitable villages; that wear and tear of tools and machinery should be figured in the prices of the finished articles as so much labor consumed in their production, and that the freedom of access to craftsmen's techniques would result in a type of society in which the harshness of the competitive processes would be immeasurably softened.[3]

Warren insisted that public opinion of the group of coöperators would establish a price for each article of commerce on the basis of the average

---

1. *Practical Details,* 43.
2. Years later Warren asserted that philanthropy was an improper method of underwriting colonies of his kind and that he never expected substantial help from such sources; "Throughout the whole course of the practical developments of the subject, I have been thoroughly satisfied that it would never have the aid or co-operation of capitalists, until we could prove that we could do without them; . . . In justice to the very few Robert Owens and William McClures it is necessary to discriminate between them and mere capitalists—they were men as well as capitalists, . . ." *Peaceful Revolutionist,* II (May, 1848), 5.
3. *Free Enquirer,* II (August 14, 1830), 332.

number of hours expended in its production, with the attempt constantly being made to reduce this estimate as proficiency in production increased. Thus, he argued, if the labor price of a pair of shoes was estimated by his hypothetical community at ten hours, and one shoemaker succeeded in making a pair in six hours which compared with the average in quality, he would thus receive ten hours of labor on his behalf for his six. In like manner, the less skillful shoemaker who was able to produce a pair in no less than twelve hours would thus be forced to exchange twelve hours for ten. Since this was obviously uneconomic in his particular case, it was essential that complete freedom to experiment in other occupations be provided, until the person in question succeeded in developing skill in a trade or occupation which permitted him to maintain his position on an equitable basis within the group. This simple economic doctrine formed the basis of Warren's attack upon the apprentice system, which he claimed produced monopolies of skills and encouraged a vicious, unnatural kind of competition. These, and other particulars of his equal exchange of labor teachings, appeared in various New York newspapers during this period of inaction.[4]

Restless and disillusioned by the lack of substantial aid from Owen, Warren left New York in August, 1830, and made his way back to Ohio. Here he renewed his former associations and friendships in social action. An interesting interlude now transpired, during which the practical aspects of coöperative labor exchange received their first test under community conditions. In May of this same year, while on his way to New York, he had become acquainted with a curious little group located at Spring Hill, just beyond Massillon, Ohio. In January, 1829, a group of five men under the leadership of Samuel Underhill[5] had begun a small manual training school there which included a community of property arrangement for the twenty-five children under their care. The men were veterans of three Owenite colonies and recently had separated from that at Kendal,[6] a few miles to the east on the outskirts of Canton. A year and a half before, the death of a Quaker lady named Charity Rotch had placed at their disposal the interest from a sum of $22,000 previously set aside for this purpose by her, for the benefit of an undesignated number of "poor children." The bequest provided that the income of the communal school was to be augmented by the proceeds derived from the sale of the products of these children, who were, strangely enough, besides being required to attend school from three to four hours daily, made subject to a possible work day of an additional eight hours.[7]

---

[4] See for example the extended favorable comment in the *New York Daily Sentinel* on Warren's "Equitable Commerce," reprinted in *Free Enquirer,* II (July 24, 1830), 308.

[5] The others were Hezekiah Camp of New York, William G. Macy of Nantucket, Mass., who later followed Warren to New Harmony and became a permanent settler there, James Bayliss of New York, and Edward Dunn of Philadelphia. *Free Enquirer,* III (February 26, 1831), 137. These men were among the charter members of the "Friendly Association for Mutual Interests at Kendal, Ohio," which lasted from March 17, 1826 to January 6, 1829. See Wendall P. Fox, "The Kendal Community," in *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly,* XX (April-July, 1911), 178, 182.

[6] There is conflicting material relative to Spring Hill and Kendal. The town of Kendal probably was confused with the Owenite colony of the same name. This may account for the name appearing in various circumstances in the 1830's. The people who founded the "Kendal Community" bought 2113 acres of land in the town of Kendal and vicinity and also the vicinity of Massillon for a price of $20,000. According to one source the decision to start such a colony came as the result of a visit in 1825 by Josiah Warren

Warren found this small group of men busily engaged with the boys and girls, all between the ages of ten and sixteen. The school was in the fifth month of its second year at the time of his visit. The situation of the orphan children in their new environment delighted and surprised him; to him it was proof of Owen's theories in the most decisive manner. A subsequent dispatch printed in the *Free Enquirer* contained the following observations:[8]

> I saw children who a little more than a year before were destitute orphans and who . . . might have been . . . shut up in a house of correction . . . a house of Refuge or some other monument of human ignorance, now living as happy as they could well be . . . I saw young females who, had they been in the cities, would have been compelled to waste away . . . in unremitting toil at their needles for 12½ cents a day or . . . to drag out a monotonous life of enervating servitude in the kitchens of the rich . . . I saw them here comparatively independent and daily acquiring an education . . . which would enable them to supply their own wants and conduct their own affairs. . . . The boys had ac-

---

and Paul Brown, who encouraged this step. This may possibly be true, but Warren never mentioned being in Kendal at any time before the spring of 1830.

The colony visited by Frederick William Evans in this area in mid-1830 could not have been Kendal, nor Spring Hill, in view of the few adults at the latter place. The account of the dissolution of Kendal given by John Humphrey Noyes also seems inaccurate. Samuel Underhill, William Macy, Bayliss and Dunn all severed their relationships with the Kendal Community October 5, 1828. Matthew Macy, the former Clerk of the Community, was an agent for the *Free Enquirer* at Kendal six years after the dissolution. See Fox, "The Kendal Community," 176-177, 212-213; Evans, *Autobiography of a Shaker,* 15; Noyes, *American Socialisms,* 79-80; *Free Enquirer,* II, 3rd. series, (January 4, 1835), 8.

[7] Mention of the Rotch benefaction is contained in the minutes of the Kendal Community for June 16, 1827. Nothing was done about actually beginning a school until the following April and May, and since the men delegated to do this job left the community five months later, it is improbable that any educative innovations were begun under the auspices of the Kendal people. See the minutes of the Journal for April 26, May 3, May 24, 1828, reproduced in Fox, "The Kendal Community," 198, 209, 211. For a discussion of Quaker schools of the period compare with the account of Carl Russell Fish, *The Rise of the Common Man, 1830-1850* (Arthur M. Schlesinger and Dixon R. Fox, *A History of American Life,* vol. VI) (New York, 1927), 205-206.

[8] *Free Enquirer,* III (February 26, 1831), 137-138.

> quired a practical knowledge of agriculture . . ., and the girls of housewifery and domestic economy.

Despite the functioning of the communal school, and the existing commitment to continue the venture under this arrangement for two more years,[9] Underhill and his associates listened sympathetically to Warren's proposal to change the basis of the economic activities to one of individualism, featuring the coöperation and cost price elements which he had developed in his Cincinnati store.[10] It was to this little group of acquaintances that Warren returned, remaining for the better part of a year.[11] During this period, several elements of the labor exchange plan were worked out. Along with the introduction of labor notes in a variety of activities, Warren reported satisfactory results in the new attack on apprenticeships. Twelve persons were reported to have learned to make shoes successfully in less than a month. Warren himself learned to make wagon wheels in five days. He also conducted a music school for twenty children upon the labor exchange idea, the pupils paying their share of the two hour lessons with their own labor notes for six minutes of their own time. At the same time investigations were carried on in learning the intricacies of iron working, spinning machinery, printing, type casting and house construction, in attempts to learn how soon the mastery of the skills involved could be done. This investigation continued into other activities which were considered vital to the beginning of an individualist colony without outside aid, Warren insisting that "the movement must be carried on by those who have nothing but their hands, their time, and their necessities."[12]

At this same time, Warren began his experiments with vocational training for children, seeking among other things to convert young people into productive members of the community in as short a time as possible while avoiding injurious and artificial influences. He was convinced that the apprentice system and unequal pay for children either resulted in exploiting young people or in confining them to a parasitical existence in the interest of eliminating pressure for jobs. He sought the remedy in placing boys of eleven or twelve years of age upon their own resources, assuring them of full return for their efforts, and giving them full responsibility over their own activities and decisions. He insisted that admission of the young to adult circles, in economic matters at least, could begin much earlier than usually supposed, without any element of the exploitive paternalism generally associated with child labor within the family group.

---

[9] *Practical Details,* 56.

[10] Underhill remained associated with Warren until about the time that the Tuscarawas community began in 1833. He had long been in the free thought movement, and returned to it after leaving community life; he published the *Cleveland Liberalist* from 1836 to 1838. Warren obtained second hand types for him while in New York. Albert Post, *Popular Freethought in America, 1825-1850,* p. 63; *Free Enquirer,* II (July 17, 1830), 302.

[11] *Free Enquirer,* III (May 28, 1831), 252.

[12] *Practical Details,* 46-48, 55-56.

He insisted also that the usual position of relationships be reversed in teaching trades, and that the pupil pay his instructor according to the time of the latter which was actually spent teaching the trade in question. "When we admit the rights of children," Warren declared, "and acknowledge that there is no equitable ground of demands upon them, only as equivalents for what they receive of us, . . . and set an example which it would be safe and legitimate for them to follow out toward us . . . this, then, is education."[13]

Acquaintance with the realities of life at an early age would provide an understanding of the law of self-preservation. Assurance that all exertion would be followed by a commensurate benefit or gratification would supply incentive or motivation for the assumption of independence in economic matters. All other approaches to child control, including demands for the practice of self-denial and arbitrary compliance to parental command, Warren deplored as double-standard selfishness and the wielding of "false power" over one's child delegated by "ignorant law-makers." The stories of a number of boys placed on the new equitable relations at Spring Hill were related by Warren, including that of the son of the director, who succeeded in making a pair of shoes for himself in less than two days, and continued in this capacity until the need of the community for other shoes had been fully supplied.[14]

Within a period of less than three years, then, a number of the elements of a non-exploitive economic self-sufficiency had been tried out: (1) the cost basis of price; (2) the coöperative nature of production with provision for individual responsibility in the matter of both quantity and quality; (3) the problem of artificial restraints on production represented by the apprenticeship system and the educational structure. When one includes Warren's stand on money and land with these matters, it can be seen that the logical extension of these economic doctrines led to a rejection of the state, but such considerations were not of particular concern at this time. Later exponents of anti-statism recognized this repeatedly, when the state's function in protecting the economic and social structure of society came under direct fire and when the term "anarchism" had begun to be used to designate opposition to institutional government.[15]

---

13. *Practical Details,* 66.
14. *Equitable Commerce,* 82-83.
15. The writings of Ezra Heywood and Benjamin Tucker illustrate this matter in great detail after 1875, in particular. It is interesting to observe that Warren himself used the word "anarchy" as a synonym for chaos. There is no indication from an examination of his published works or manuscripts that he ever recognized the usage it acquired after the time of Proudhon as the name for a particular kind of social organization. See example of this former use by Warren in *Peaceful Revolutionist,* II (May, 1848), 2.

The decision to delay the formation of a full-fledged mutualist colony until the termination of the Spring Hill contract, which was not scheduled until 1833, brought about Warren's discussion of the political character of equity and its collision with the existing order of things. Having become convinced that the silence of the newspapers at the time of his 1827 time store had been due to deference to the pressure of their merchant advertisers, he carried the fight into a new area. He succeeded in developing a cheap modified proof press which, when used in conjunction with an ingenious stereotyping invention, not only drew repeated attention in New York[16] but enabled him to become a publisher and delineator of his own brand of radicalism. "Printing is a power that governs the destinies of mankind," declared Warren in 1830; "those who can control the Printing Press can control their fellow creatures."[17] The step from inventor to that of pioneer anarchist pamphleteer was no longer difficult to make.

Warren's time for the next two years was taken up by a variety of activities. He returned to Cincinnati, attempted to market his new press, and formed a small group for the purpose of discussing and studying the social questions which he now challenged. His former associate, John Pickering, became a prominent supporter at this time. Spirited arguments took place relative to the merits of "equitable commerce," a number of which were admitted to be highly critical, although the nature of the criticism was never made known by Warren in his printed works.[18] Of his activities in the Cincinnati cholera epidemic of 1832, little is known beyond the fragmentary reminiscences of his son, over sixty years later.[19]

In January, 1833, the first issue of *The Peaceful Revolutionist* appeared.[20] Warren had previously confined his attentions to economic matters, concentrating on principles which tended to promote the survival of a coöperative group within the state but ignoring its processes. Now he engaged in vigorous criticisms of political and philosophical content. Buttressing his rebel's approach by a serious study of Alexander Bryan Johnson's pioneer work on semantics, *A Treatise on Language,*[21] he made use of the current national crisis, especially the proposed Georgia general convention of the states and the nullification controversy to serve as illustrations in championing his brand of individualism as the correct foundation of social organization, at the same time delivering a blast at government and law as agencies utilizing coercive authority derived solely from majority sanction.

---

[16] *Free Enquirer,* II (March 13, 1830), 157. It is a coincidence that the first power press in America was introduced by the Hoe Company in this same year. John C. Oswald, *A History of Printing* (New York, 1928), 343-344. Warren asserted that the Hoe proof presses supplied to New York offices in 1832 employed his design with a few variations, following a public exhibition of his press there in that year. *Periodical Letter,* I, 2nd. series, (September, 1856), 13; *Free Enquirer,* IV (March 3, 1832), 152. The Warren press was accompanied by a stereotype process which substituted actual types instead of punches, over which warm lead was poured, obviating the stamping of copper matrices. This resulted in a less clear but much cheaper printing face. See descriptions in *Free Enquirer,* II (March 13, 1830), 157; George Warren, "Josiah Warren," 1-2.

[17] *Free Enquirer,* II (March 13, 1830), above.

[18] *Practical Details,* 44, 48, 59.

[19] Warren never alluded to his part in this catastrophe in any of his writings which have thus far been discovered and preserved. See also George Warren, "Josiah Warren," 2.

[20] This was a four page, two-column paper similar in style and format to the *New Harmony Gazette,* occasionally reprinting articles which had appeared in this latter publication. The subscription price of Warren's paper was 37¢ for six months; labor notes of members of the Spring Hill group were accepted in lieu of currency, if presented.

Government and law, argued Warren, were merely forms of language, not material things, and as such were by their nature subject to an innumerable variety of different definitions, constructions, and applications. It was unrealistic for the Georgia legislature to become disturbed by "conflicting interests" which had recently gained national prominence. They were but a natural consequence of assumed powers resulting from confused concepts of law and government.[22] Continuing along the line of abstract semantic analysis and ignoring the impact of ideological acceptance which made discussion of such nature real to the general public, Warren made light of nullification as he brusquely interpreted the whole matter as a quarrel between "dignity and liberty,—one a shadow and the other a ghost":[23]

> Dignity insists upon it that the *laws* shall be obeyed: and that the *union* must be preserved: but these two words *must* and *shall* rouse the ghost of murdered liberty to resistance. Dignity abandons the real subject of dispute, and resolves the whole matter into a mystical reverence for the two words *union* and *laws.* I say for two words: because if we look for their meaning, we find, as in all other words of a general and indefinite character, there are very few, if any, who will agree in their manner of applying them. If the word law has ever meant one thing more than another, that thing has been *the will of those in power.*

Having made this stark observation, he went on to say that union in the sense of a similarity of interests, feelings, objectives, mutual assistance and "coöperating action" had never existed except in time of grave peril. The nearest thing to such a state of affairs had been present only at the time of the Revolution, a matter of reality and not a mere verbalism. Since the union then had been a creature of circumstances, the fight for separation from England, it should have ceased at the termination of the struggle. The subsequent "compact of union," however, he considered an "incomprehensible something" into which our ancestors had been "betrayed." It required all to register similarity in thought and action without reason to demand or power to compel. If a universally-held sentiment of any kind prevailed at all, Warren persisted, it was the desire to be free to differ from others, for which the existing framework of government made no provision. Without respect for the right to disassociate, non-coercive preservation of the union was an impossibility.[24]

---

[21] It is probable that Warren became acquainted with this work while in New York; a favorable review of the 1828 edition, written by Frances Wright, appeared in the *Free Enquirer,* I (March 18, 1829), 166. For a recent renewal of interest in this work see David Rynin, ed., *A Treatise on Language* (Berkeley, Calif., 1947). Another of Johnson's pioneer works in semantics is *The Meaning of Words* (New York, 1862). For biographical items on Johnson see *Appleton's Cyclopaedia,* III, 436, and the biographical sketch in the *Dictionary of American Biography,* X, 78-79, by James D. Magee.

[22] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (February 5, 1833), 8.

[23] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (February 5, 1833), 5. In connection with the discussion of word meanings Warren remarked that "by the word 'union,' some refer to certain words on paper which serve as an excuse for a great deal of speech making and disunion every year at the rate of eight dollars per day."

Warren's unqualified attachment to the exchange of equivalents at or near labor cost put him on the side of the South at least in the matter of economics.[25] A tariff was a most invasive act, little better than thievery on a genteel, while collar level. Opposition to collection of a portion of a neighbor's property to pay for services neither received nor desired became a traditional anarchist policy in later years. Its earliest statement by Warren was brought out by the circumstances attending the resistance by South Carolina to imposition and collection of duties by the federal government. Warren ignored the political and personal issues involved, and blamed the business system for the origin and spread of the tariff as idea and as policy. He indicted "foreign and domestic capitalists" for having precipitated the controversy, including the waste of money involved and the possible provocation of a civil war, the thought of which he abhorred. Warren's position was more than a criticism of the protection-of-infant-industry tariff argument. His solution consisted in the adoption of the non-profit labor exchange. Had it prevailed from early times, the coöperating interests essential to national good will would have been produced, and "it would have swept away the whole foundation of the tariff, and all the enormous expenses of time and money, and the difficulties and disaster of which the subject has been or may be the cause."[26]

The prophetic flavor of this latter remark gives evidence of some acquaintance with the nature of the national unrest which had been quietly brewing since the time of the Missouri Compromise, even though Warren never showed understanding or sympathy for representative government along constitutional lines. Despite an attempt at simplification of a complex problem by the substitution of a decentralized economy, he was aware of the weight of the forces of opposition to any adjustment of society on such radical lines as he suggested. These forces he saw buried within the structure of the state, sheltered by the bulwark of statute law. Henceforth the concept of the state and state-made law came in for increasing criticism.

---

[24] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (February 5, 1833), above. Warren insisted that if the union which was being considered comprised "a similarity of interests, feelings and objects, co-operating action and mutual assistance in cases of need," it was a matter of trying to "attain" such a condition, since no union based on such understandings existed to "preserve" in the first place.

[25] The fact that occupants of such extreme positions as William Lloyd Garrison and John C. Calhoun also espoused free trade illustrates the universal appeal of this approach, but Warren took no stand on the matter as far as national issues were concerned. For his attitude toward slavery, see Chapter IV.

[26] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (February 5, 1833), 6.

He concluded that individuals rather than law were the vital agency in governing under any legal system, due to the importance of interpretation by administrators. "Every election illustrates this," Warren expostulated; "we are told that our destinies depend on the election of this or that man to office! Why? This shows that it is men and not laws or principles that govern society."[27] The making of laws one year and their repeal the next, the reversals of judges and juries upon identical cases, all this was evidence enough to show, he thought, that there was no security in law and that it must be sought elsewhere. The wild fluctuation of legislation and the political intrigue associated with the public land controversy convinced him that laws and governments were public means for use as private ends. Warren challenged the right of the state to grant land titles. Such action was little more than official interference directly resulting in the creation of special privilege:[28]

> The greatest crime which can be committed against society and which causes poverty and lays the foundation of almost all other crimes is the monopoly of the soil: this has not only been permitted but protected or perpetrated by every government of modern times up to the last accounts from the congress of the United States.

Punishment of crimes against property in such situations was grave injustice. Yet it was in this manner that the people's money continued to be spent, in the enforcement of legislation by delegated authority. The legislators themselves, he argued, should be subject to severe penalties as well for having acted in the above capacity, if consistency was to be preserved in this matter.[29]

---

[27] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (April 5, 1833), 14.

[28] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (April 5, 1833), above. A moderate treatment of the federal land policies during the period can be found in Fish, *Rise of the Common Man,* 109-136. See also Raynor G. Wellington, *The Political and Sectional Influence of the Public Lands 1828-1842* (Cambridge, Mass., 1914), Chapter II.

[29] Warren never thought of law in the sense of compromise, or the expression of vacillating public policy. His demand that the laws of society be based on rigid, universally-accepted principles such as those prevailing among the scientists was little relaxed throughout his life, with the exception of a short lapse at the time of the Civil War. See Chapter IV, and also note 99, below.

An expression of anti-state sentiments on still another current issue appeared in the pages of Warren's pioneer publication. This was the matter of projected government aid to the establishment of public schools. His philosophy of education, based on the results of the Spring Hill experiences and his experiments in his own family,[30] inclined him strongly toward individualism and decentralized power in matters of education. Such a background made him unusually sensitive toward political influence in the educational structure. "The power of educating the rising generation is of too much importance to be trusted in a manageable shape in the hands of any small body of men, as society is now constituted";[31] having botched the land and tariff questions, there was little hope that lawmakers would prevent education from becoming another stronghold of irregularities. Stressing the need of placing young people on their own responsibilities at as early an age as possible, his object was to make them productive members of the community and reduce potential parasitism to a minimum.

It was not strange to hear such a philosophy in a frontier environment not yet complicated by the problem of widespread use of labor-saving machinery and the ever-widening pools of unemployed which featured the swings of the business cycles of the following century. It held that children should be paid on the same level as adults for production of comparable quantity and quality. This would encourage independence and seriously weaken the base upon which exploitation of child labor rested, he felt sure. The proverbial resistance of children to formal education would become a memory, if placed upon their own resources and forced by experience to learn the consequences of inaction or inertia; self-dependence would actually increase the desire for instruction. Schools in his social scheme existed to make children expertly acquainted with the techniques of making a living, as well as providing them with the rudiments of a cultural background.

Warren criticized as deplorable and unnecessary the use of arbitrarily inflicted punishments and the customary repressions of the school system; "The natural rewards and punishments of their conduct . . . I consider the only species of government that does not produce more evil than good."[32] Such was the simple solution to the problem of inducting the young within the loose structure of the mutualist community sketched by its first prominent exponent in America. The opportunity to observe these fundamentals in practice on the community level had finally arrived, moreover. The contract of the Quaker manual training school had expired the month Warren's publishing venture began,[33] thus releasing the members for a new experiment in community life.

---

[30] Warren placed his own children upon a labor exchange basis within the family, such was his passion for precision in all the labor relations on every conceivable level. See the description of this unusual arrangement in *Equitable Commerce,* 79-81. Referring to this inexorable perfectionism, Miss Mary Fauntleroy, nonagenarian resident of New Harmony and one of the few remaining living links to the community life and community "people," remarked to the author in 1948 that Warren's son, a close friend, often told her that his father "never let him have his breakfast until he had earned it."

[31] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (April 5, 1833), 16.

[32] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (April 5, 1833), above.

Warren understood the necessity of starting the adventure in individualist voluntarism in fresh circumstances, which made the acquisition of land in a relatively isolated area imperative.[34] A tract of four hundred acres was selected and purchased in Tuscarawas county, which became the site of the first anarchist community in America, years before anything similar was attempted in Europe.[35] Warren himself was there intermittently at the start, the original group on the grounds consisting of only six families.[36] The first few dwellings erected by the cooperators made use of the labor for labor principle. A few weeks later a steam saw mill was erected and operated on a mutual basis, another unprecedented innovation. This was an imperfectly worked-out trial, a partial answer to Warren's approach to capital in the form of one of the means of production, and in some degree indicates the reason for the limited appeal of his views on such matters to those who heard them propounded.[37]

It had been decided at a meeting at Spring Hill in February, 1831 that all capital to be invested in the mill was to be obtained through voluntary contribution, and such persons were to understand that there was to be no return in the form of interest. Warren insisted that the persons comprising the investors, apparently the majority of the members of the community, were to be free at all times to withdraw their capital, but admitted that such action would seriously embarrass the operations projected. Despite such weakness of structure, it is evident that it served its principal purpose, the supplying of lumber for the constructing of houses at an unusually cheap price as compared to prevailing rates in the surrounding countryside. No explanation was made as to how the approximate labor cost of a product resulting from the applied efforts of several persons was tabulated. Modern critics of the

---

[33] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (April 5, 1833), 15. The paper had been originally begun in order to chronicle events in a community of his own, but Warren called the effort a "dead investment" at a later time. The restricted circulation has made this journal one of the rarest collectors' items among the published materials of early nineteenth century American social history.

[34] By this time Underhill was no longer connected with the group, and the Spring Hill site was considered inadequate. For Underhill's association with Lysander Spooner, another prominent native anarchist of the post-Civil War period, see Post, *Popular Freethought,* 63.

[35] The exact site of this abbreviated colony has never been revealed, but it has generally been believed in the Tuscarawas River valley, from the description of the low-lying character of the land.

[36] *Practical Details,* 56. While here Warren acted as local agent for George Henry Evans' *The Workingmen's Advocate.* See for instance V (November 30, 1833), 4.

[37] The complete story of the experiment in coöperative industrialism is told in the *Peaceful Revolutionist,* I (April 5, 1833), 14.

Warren approach profess inability to reconcile it with the complexities furnished by present-day assembly line production with its blending of productive tasks in an overall social function, for example. With reference to Tuscarawas, this account of the labor exchange in practice is lost. In other particulars, the village realized the aspirations of community life with a maximum of individual freedom and lacking an elected officialdom, but it was not destined to succeed.

Unlike the majority of the communities of the time, Tuscarawas declined for other than economic reasons. Faulty judgment had resulted in locating the settlement on land in a low-lying area, which subjected the residents to a variety of illnesses. The principal one, judging from a description of its symptoms, was malaria, endemic in the river valleys of the old Northwest at this time and extending as far north as Detroit. By the end of the first summer, half of the adults were incapacitated, and most of the activities of the group had come to a standstill. Despite the grave concern now over the location, the company agreed to try a second year, which proved disastrous. Prostrations from disease increased, culminating in an epidemic of influenza during the winter of 1834 which spread death among some thirty families.[38]

The result was the abandonment of the first equity village early in 1835, in the face of difficulties produced by natural forces beyond the control of the settlers. It was a painful decision to make in view of the otherwise successful operations. Warren left the site before the remainder of the company, some of whom lingered in the vicinity for another two years. The fact that the colony represented their entire wealth, invested in land and buildings, made it especially difficult for some to leave. Complete removal, made ultimately at a staggering loss, was not done until 1837.[39]

Despite the abortive character of Tuscarawas, the band of Warrenites taking part in its founding made discoveries which had lasting influence. A brand of community life based on voluntary assent and lacking the formalities of majority rule[40] was entertained without calamity or social chaos. The extreme reverence for individuality in all aspects of social life, an impossibility in the highly centralized urban life of the country two generations later, was modified in accordance with the Warrenite conception of the labor cost theory. It is true that the equitists realized the deleterious effect which monopoly operation of machinery was capable of having on the labor cost exchanges, but under practical conditions, neither the finding of the labor cost price of products of social effort nor separation of capital interests took place. Yet this did not result in any irreconcilable situation.[41]

---

[38] See the accounts of this affair in *Practical Details,* 56; Warren, *Practical Applications of the Elementary Principles of "True Civilization" to the Minute Details of Every Day Life. Being Part III, the Last of the "True Civilization" Series . . . ,* 7. See bibliography for extended full title.

[39] There is no evidence to support the belief that Warren remained at Tuscarawas after 1834. His manuscript notebook "D" contains no entry dated after this year.

[40] See Fish, *Rise of the Common Man,* 315, for an interpretation of the entire generation of Americans to which this group belonged, especially their efforts to secure freedom by constricting the scope of government.

Tuscarawas became an inspiration rather than a source of dismay to Josiah Warren and his associates. The intention of trying once more had been voiced repeatedly before dispersal took place. The time and place were to be determined when a sufficient amount of capital had once more been accumulated. The anarchist character of Warren's objective continued to be negative; no intent to overthrow any existing order ever became part of his strategy. Compared to the propaganda on the grand scale of the European school, his objectives were excessively modest. He built simply upon the assertion of the possibility of economic survival of the small self-sufficient community within the structure of the state, complemented by determination to ignore all institutions of the latter in a passive manner, when they were not founded so as to respect individual sovereignty and voluntary coöperation.

Enthusiasm and conviction notwithstanding, community activity along individualist lines ceased for over ten years after the final dissolution of Tuscarawas. The intervention of two unexpected developments helped postpone this matter, contributing to the shifting of Warren's attention elsewhere temporarily. One of these was the business and financial panic of 1837, the other the meteoric rise and spread of the joint-stock associationism of Charles Fourier, which dominated the persons with a bent for community-joining for the next decade. Both factors tended to inhibit individualist community attempts, although they stimulated individualist literature of notable quality.[42] Warren regarded the Fourierite association as little more than a resurgency of the Owenite community of property. Nevertheless, he expressed great admiration for the energetic propagation of its basic ideas. In fact, he ascribed part of his inability to further his own ideas as due to the devotion of the Fourierite propagandists, observing with ill-concealed satisfaction at a later time that the rapid abandonment of the great majority of the phalanxes contributed to a revived interest in "equitable commerce."[43]

Conflicting accounts are responsible for the lack of accurate information concerning Warren from the time of his removal from the scene at Tuscarawas.[44] The next twelve years comprise a feverish record of constant moving, inventions, spasmodic publishing and further minor social and economic experimentation. Leaving Cincinnati once more,[45] he returned to New Harmony, the scene of his introduction to the heady brew of societary reconstruction. The first few years found him concerned with the problems of making a living in an economy demoralized by the reigning panic and depression. The family had hardly settled down in New Harmony, when the urge to continue work on a printing press of unorthodox construction found him returning to Cincinnati in the spring of 1839.[46] In about eight months he perfected and constructed a new "high speed" press, printing from continuous rolls of paper at a rate of three to four thousand impressions an hour, an achievement previously unheard of in the Northwest country, and unmatched except by the most advanced innovations in printing which were coming into use in the urban East.[47] Although not a true web press,[48] the speed of the new machine caused consternation among the printers of Evansville, where it was taken after completion to be used in the publication of the *Southwestern Sentinel*.[49] Warren, thinking along cost lines, figured he

---

[41] It is worth noticing that Warren was not too clearly aware of the problem created by the functioning of associated activities. As he had reconciled cost price and barter economies in Cincinnati without paying much attention to their divergent bases, so he acquiesced to individual and collective production at Tuscarawas without recognition of any particular doctrinal conflict.

[42] For the contributions of the individualists to economic thinking during the period of Fourierist ascendancy, see Seligman, *Essays in Economics,* 143-144.

[43] *Practical Details,* 57, 89.

[44] A. J. MacDonald's account records an attempted community at Mount

---

Vernon, Indiana, after Tuscarawas, while George Warren avers that the family spent the time from the departure from this place until 1838 at another colonial attempt at Trenton, Ohio. Neither of these experiences were ever confirmed by Warren or any associate. See accounts in Noyes, *American Socialisms,* 95; George Warren, "Josiah Warren," 2. It is highly probable that the return to New Harmony occurred in 1837, in view of the fact that Warren's daughter, Caroline Maria, married John Christopher Fory there in this year, according to vital statistics records of the Workingmen's Institute.

[45] Fanny Wright bought the Cincinnati house of the Warren family at this time. Perkins and Wolfson, *Frances Wright,* 360-361.

[46] George Warren, "Josiah Warren," 3-4. Warren's wife did not accompany him on this occasion. Dues account books of the New Harmony library record occasional payments by Mrs. Warren during the remainder of the year.

[47] It is probable that Warren's press was the most rapid in existence for a time, although the Hoe "Revolving Machine," which is credited with the printing of 8000 unbacked impressions an hour in 1845, surpassed it. Charles T. Jacobi, article "Printing," in *Encyclopedia Britannica,* XI ed., XXII, 353.

[48] The first press employing the continuous web of paper and printing from plates attached to cylinders is generally credited to William Bullock of Philadelphia in 1865, although the process of printing from curved plates on a rotary press had been perfected by Charles Craske in New York as early as 1854. Jacobi, "Printing," above; George A. Kubler, *A New History of Stereotyping* (New York, 1941), 174.

Warren's press had the familiar flat bed, but the paper fed through mechanically, printing on one side and rewinding at the other end of the press. New plates had to be inserted in the bed and the operation of the press reversed to obtain the backed impression. The draftsman's illustration of this press, by William P. Elliott, which was to have accompanied the description of the press to Washington for patent application, can be seen on exhibition in the Workingmen's Institute Library in New Harmony.

[49] The press did not reach Evansville for two months after completion, the steamboat on which it was loaded in Cincinnati being caught in a freeze-up of the Ohio and forced ashore at Madison, Indiana on New Year's Day, 1840. George Warren, "Josiah Warren," above.

had produced an instrument of benefaction, but for the first time collided with the phenomenon of sabotage, a growing weapon of labor in fighting monopolistic control and manipulation of labor-saving machinery.[50] Returning once more to New Harmony, he found himself called repeatedly to Evansville to repair calculated breakdowns. This continued for about two years, following which he dismantled the machine and brought it to New Harmony, where he used part of it himself in his own printing operations.[51]

Warren found New Harmony apathetic to his labor exchange program. Ten years had brought about numerous changes in attitudes among several segments of the town's population, including a merchant-landowning circle of individuals who by this time had become conservative. These persons were especially opposed to any tampering with prevailing attitudes, and their first efforts inhibited most of the proposals intended to demonstrate the principles of equity. His attempt to conduct a manual training academy, or as he styled it, a "labor for labor seminary," was effectively scuttled[52] after operating for a few months early in 1840. Public lectures on the subject, delivered in the Rappite Community House No. 1 during March of the same year brought concerted opposition from the local merchants when it became known that a revival of the time store had been freely and favorably discussed.[53]

Discouraged by the show of opposition which closed the town to his ideas, and by the lack of aid in any substantial form, he again journeyed into Ohio, lecturing in Cincinnati and vicinity.[54] While here, utilizing his skill in printing and his new press, he brought out another short-lived anarchist periodical, the *Herald of Equity,* in February, 1841.[55]

---

[50] Compare the Warren story with the account of the sabotage of the press introduced in England for the printing of the *Times* in 1814 by William Koenig in Oswald, *History of Printing,* 339-340.

[51] Warren for a time did some commercial printing there, one of the books being a New Harmony edition of François Michaux's pioneer botanical study, *North American Sylva.* The edition Warren worked on was never completed, the unbound sheets being destroyed in a fire shortly after printing. Elias Durand, "Biographical Memoir of the Late François Andre Michaux," in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society,* XI (December 5, 1856), 8; Jacob Schneck and Richard Owen, *The History of New Harmony,* 15; Meredith Nicholson, *The Hoosiers,* 129.

[52] See entry of January 21, 1840, in Notebook "D." It is interesting to find that the first two books which were to have been required reading in the school were Johnson's *Treatise on Language* and Robert Owen's *Essays on the Formation of Human Character,* the works which no doubt had made more impression on Warren's development as a social thinker than any other. At "Modern Times" Warren wanted "every one to become familiar with 'Johnson on language.' " Warren to Stephen Pearl Andrews, June 10, 1852, Baskette Collection.

[53] Notebook "D," March 29, 1840. Samuel Bolton, a local merchant, was an outspoken opponent of the plan at the first public meeting.

[54] *Practical Details,* 84.

[55] The publication in Cincinnati in 1839 of a book on banking reform is thought to have been considerably influenced by Warren's ideas on currency. Titled *Money and Banking, or Their Nature and Effects Considered; To-*

Once more, he doggedly attacked the conventional methods of exchange, and expounded the labor cost principle in a form which appeared practically unaltered in all subsequent native anarchist economic writing.

Warren insisted that society no longer could entertain the identification of cost with value; the two terms had no common denominator. "Value to the *receiver* is an unjust, a false standard of price," he said.[56] The idea that the price of an object was what it would bring on the market he called "the pitfall of the working classes." When coupled to the accepted relation of supply and demand, this merely created a state of "civilized cannibalism." The most successful speculator conscious of maximum want was enabled to practice a type of scientific extortion upon the community. Using gross extremes for examples, he was completely at a loss to find justification for this device. For instance, what was the price of a loaf of bread to a starving man, when taken from the standpoint of need? Attempting to inject humanitarianism into economics, Warren could find nothing suggesting justice in such or similar situations, unless it be based on his ubiquitous exchange of equivalent amount of labor time spent in production.[57]

By this time the element of repugnance as a factor in determining labor time had entered the picture. This, along with the relative intensity of the industry involved, perennial vexations to labor cost theorists, had been encountered at Tuscarawas, and became items of concern as time went on.[58]

When it came to the matter of the utilization of labor currency as the circulating medium, Warren, with a sense of grim satisfaction, saw it as a principle leading eventually in the elimination of two pet grievances, banks and bankers. "All money and bank notes as now known and used, act as drafts or demands upon labor and they are all issued by those who do not labor," he angrily declaimed. Convinced that bankers performed no functions serving the wants of group living, no possible manner in which they or any other "non-productive" elements of "society" might share in the products of labor presented itself to him.[59] In this starkly materialistic conception, the doctrine of equitable labor

---

gether With a Plan for the Universal Diffusion of Their Legitimate Benefits Without Their Evils, its author remains unknown, although the publisher, William Beck, is generally considered to have written it. In view of the national character of the proposed reforms, it is highly improbable that the association with labor exchange concepts and individual control over one's labor notes advocated by Warren supports this thesis. See Hoagland, "Humanitarianism," in Commons, *History of Labor,* I, 511-512, for intimation of the former relation.

[56] *Herald of Equity,* I, 5.

[57] *Herald of Equity,* I, 2-3.

[58] One of the grounds under which Warren later justified the indulgence in barter was simply as a consequence of the individual sovereignty doctrine, which included the right to transact economic affairs in any way an individual might choose.

[59] *Herald of Equity,* I, 7.

exchange confined control of its exchange medium to the participating members exclusively. Although it remained for later associates to more fully expand the indictment of banking as a consciously created and protected monopoly of the state, the Warren condemnation contained the core of anarchist sentiment. When viewed against the backdrop of distress occasioned by the panic and controversy over the re-chartering of the United States Bank, the notorious corruption associated with the wild cat banks, and the intensified shortage of credit existing, it is probable that Warren was speaking for more than people of his own particular convictions.

Mid-November, 1841 found Warren back in New Harmony.[60] The seven years since Tuscarawas had not erased his enthusiasm for new experiments in coöperative economy. The relative improvement of his fortunes by this time, reinforced by the unsubstantiated belief that the attraction toward Fourierism had declined among those of the general public who still had hopes for economic reform, combined to encourage once more a "plunge into the arena," as he dramatically described the decision to operate another time store.

The resistance of the merchants to the establishment of a store selling at near cost price again made its appearance, but only partial success attended their efforts this time. Lectures in the surrounding countryside had their effect, and encouraged by support from several sources within the town, Warren spent the winter of 1841-1842 preparing to open the store.[61] Stocked with the usual staples at the start, obtained primarily from Cincinnati wholesale dealers, the New Harmony time store opened for business on March 22, 1842. Unable to obtain access to property in the town proper, the venture was located approximately half a mile south, on the Mount Vernon Road. Again the customers took part in the voluntary labor for labor exchange, making use of the familiar labor note currency.[62] The drastic cut in prices attracted a widely scattered patronage, some of the participants coming from points as far as one hundred miles from New Harmony.[63] In view of the discussion provoked by the functioning of the labor exchange at Tuscarawas, there now entered into the issue of labor currency the matter of intensity of work and also the further qualifying circumstance of previous training, which for the first time was considered a legitimate portion of the cost of labor. As in Cincinnati, each individual decided the value of his own labor note, the expectation being that the general opinion of the people involved in the labor exchange would eventually set an average for the various products and services in terms of labor price.

---

[60] *Practical Details,* 83.

[61] *Practical Details,* 57,89. Warren occasionally reacted strongly to the rumors which accompanied his activities, and at one time stopped long enough to bring out a small pamphlet titled *Manifesto.* Dated November 27, 1841, it contained a denial that he was in the process of forming any colonies as the neighborhood was accustomed to think of them. A recent edition of this scarce and interesting statement of Warren's ideas is that by Joseph Ishill (Berkeley Heights, N.J., 1952).

[62] Examples of the labor notes used in the New Harmony time store are among the Warren MSS. in the Workingmen's Institute Library.

[63] *Practical Details,* 90-91; George Warren, "Josiah Warren," 4. See also the report of W. J. Sweasey, reprinted in *Equitable Commerce,* 86. Sweasey, in this town report of the Warrenite coöperative and labor exchange, estimated its noticeable influence "forty miles around."

The matter of depreciation and possible non-redemptions, the former the result of over-issue, were more theoretical than actual weaknesses, even if there were instances of both.[64] Warren said that counterfeit currency and bank failures cause far more losses than unredeemed and over-issued labor notes. In several cases, the labor notes assumed a degree of validity to him which surpassed his faith in the nation's currency. While in New York, sixteen years later, he admitted having New Harmony labor notes, accepted in 1842 for several types of services, which he firmly believed would be honored even then, had he cared to present them for redemption.[65] Despite the fact that such notes might present no danger of depreciation, the promise to furnish a specified amount of time in some occupation over sustained periods of time was predicated upon the physical ability and willingness to perform when the note was presented. Labor currency, like other types involving the element of faith, was not able to completely escape the psychological difficulty created by the operation of ideological and moral issues upon otherwise mechanical factors.

Josiah Warren's second time store created a memorable impression upon the town of New Harmony. The impact of the new rock-bottom pricing on the credit structure erected by the local merchants was disastrous,[66] but even more ominous in the eyes of the orthodox were the bi-monthly discussions of the affairs of the labor exchange participants in the once-forbidden Rappite Community House No. 1,[67] an affair which promised to undermine the local retail situation even more. It was no more the intention to disrupt the economic order of New Harmony[68] than it had been in Cincinnati a decade and a half before, but for the second time Warren had to bow before the expedient use of his methods by a group which understood the immediate results of such a system but preferred to ignore the original impulse responsible for it in the first place. Warren once more admitted failure after having demonstrated on the simplest practical level in the hopes of setting up in the nearby area another equitable colony. No newspapers in the area risked the wrath of advertisers to print his few communications, and the entire affair was shunned by the prominent residents of the town. A pair of small periodicals, *The Gazette of Equitable Commerce,* which he put out, and *The Problem Solved,* an effort of an associate, Thomas Varney, both failed. Warren recalled that the former acquired only four subscribers in the two years of operation.[69] As a result, he found that the "community people" of New Harmony were not interested in his activities other than taking advantage of their effectiveness against the incipient local monopolies of their own merchants. Favorable reports[70] on the soundness of the store notwithstanding, its doors closed in March, 1844, and the attempt to found a mutualist community in the environs of New Harmony was slowly strangled by apathy. If the Owenite communities of property disintegrated as a result of indecision after a brief period of great promise, a parallel can be seen in the dissipation of Warrenism in hesitancy and inaction.

---

[64] A. J. MacDonald's eye-witness report, as published by Noyes, is illuminating; "I have seen Mr. Warren with a large bundle of these notes, representing various kinds and quantities of labor, from mechanics and others in New Harmony and vicinity. Each individual who gave a note, affixed his or her own price per hour of labor. Warren charged as high, or nearly as high, as other men; and sometimes unskillful hands over-rated their services. I knew one instance where an individual issued too many of his notes, and they depreciated in value. I was informed that these notes were refused at the Time Store. It was supposed that public opinion would regulate these things, and I have not doubt that in time it would. In this experiment Mr. Warren said he had demonstrated as much as he intended. But I heard him complain of the difficulties he had to contend with, and especially the lack of common honesty." Noyes, *American Socialisms,* 97.

[65] *Periodical Letter,* I, 2nd. series, 118; Nicholson, *The Hoosiers,* 129-130.

[66] *Practical Details,* 91. See note 70, below, for reports of individuals participating in the store with reference to deflation of prices in the local retail outlets.

[67] Formerly the home of Robert Dale and David Dale Owen, it is highly probable that ownership still resided in the Owen family and accounted for its being placed at Warren's disposal.

The time store idea persevered, however. A small number of farmers and local workers of scanty means felt its loss severely at this time, and agitated for the beginning of another.[71] The mid-forties were still opportune times for the re-birth of the old community ideas and the intellectual radicalism usually attending their discussion. Robert Owen had returned to the old haunts in October, 1844,[72] just at the height of the feverish political campaign which saw his son Robert Dale waging a successful fight for re-election to the United States House of Representatives. The cause of the respectable liberals in New Harmony and vicinity found expression in the pages of Alexander Burns, Jr.'s *Indiana Statesman,* which devoted most of its pages to castigations of Henry Clay and the Whigs of Posey County, while carefully side-stepping Warren's perturbing doctrines. The uncomfortable slavery and land reform issues fared no better, however, even though dispatches from sundry reform papers sometimes obtained brief recognition in the exchanges.

---

[68] In a long communication to the *Indiana Statesman* of February 1, 1845, Warren re-asserted his earlier stand on his intention to merely illustrate the possibilities of an economy in which cost would regulate all its parts, and that his intention had not been to break up the retail store structure in the town. Five of the ten stores in operation before the time store began were now closed. He further admitted that individualism in business which was unqualified by coöperation produced a destructive competition, and "their iniquitous modes of action are fairly entitled to all that has been of late so strongly urged against them."

[69] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* II (May, 1848), 1. The enterprise was completely ignored by the local newspaper until it had ceased operating. Warren accused fifty other journals of totally neglecting his communications from the time store during its two year existence. *Practical Details,* 92.

[70] Seven of these reports are reprinted in *Equitable Commerce,* 85-89. Two of them are by William G. Macy, a former associate of Warren at Spring Hill, and M. W. Rowe, who later became a charter member of the local chapter of the Free Land Association.

[71] *Indiana Statesman,* February 1, 1845.

[72] See *Indiana Statesman,* October 5, October 26, December 28, 1844; August 16, October 11, 1845; March 14, 1846, for itinerary of the elder Owen.

Despite the unceasing propaganda for his own reform interests, the champion of mutualism sided wholeheartedly with the local affiliates of George Henry Evans and their campaign for free homesteads and limitation on the ownership of land. Although his principal objective in starting the time store had been the destruction of the credit system, which he decried as "that monstrous second feudalism,"[73] the loss of lands as the result of tax delinquency was a cause of much apprehension on his part as well as distress in the county.[74] Although he never joined the Free Land Association, having rejected political action,[75] his efforts as a printer were at their disposal as a means of reaching the public.[76]

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that Warren's last bid for support among New Harmony's radicals, in the early months of 1847, was hardly noticed. Impressed by the enthusiasm of Evans and Lewis Masquerier and the bright promises reflected in the pages of *Young America,* the erstwhile sympathizers of coöperative colonization had by now placed their hopes in the quest of free land through political pressure.[77] With

---

Owen delivered addresses in October and November of the first year to New Harmony residents at the Workingmen's Institute.

[73] *Practical Details,* 91.

[74] The loss of lands as a result of failure to pay debts was also a matter of urgent interest to Warren. The acquisition of lands by merchants and the issue of foreclosure as well as failure to pay taxes created a local political issue of intriguing character. The Whigs came under considerable fire, disgruntled townsmen averring collusion between state legislators and the merchants and large land owners. See *Indiana Statesman,* November 30, 1844, for a typical list being posted for tax delinquency, which incidentally included a lot of Warren's in Robb Township of Posey County, to the north of New Harmony.

[75] See memorials of this group described in the "Journal" of the Free Land Association of New Harmony, addressed to Robert Dale Owen and also Joshua Giddings of Ohio, better known for his part in the abolitionist movement. The former is undated, the latter bears the date December 27, 1848. This interesting manuscript volume has been mutilated, but still contains valuable information concerning the operation of the Free Land Association on a local chapter basis.

[76] See minutes of January 20, 1847 of the Free Land Association "Journal," for vote of thanks to Warren for reprinting an issue of George Henry Evans' *Young America* for pamphleteering purposes of the land reform group.

[77] When the free land group ceased agitating is not known; latter portions of the "Journal" have been scissored out, unfortunately, and other sources remain obscure.

the aid of a handful of supporters, Warren resolutely went about acquiring land around his previous time store. A third time store began retailing goods there on February 16, 1847.[78] The labor note system went into use at the same time, accompanied by ambitious plans for the sale of lots to potential settlers who in the aggregate were to comprise what he whimsically referred to as "That Village."[79] Plans were completed for a twentieth anniversary convention on the grounds on May 18 to celebrate the opening of the first store in Cincinnati. But doubt as to the possible survival value of this last effort began to assail him before the winter was over, and he decided to sell his interests in the ill-fated trial before it was hardly more than two months old.[80] On this wavering note the period of social experimentation in New Harmony ended, almost two decades after the dissolution of the parent inspiration of the entire impulse.

The expectation of outside aid, especially from the Owens, was no longer in consideration. The patriarch of New Lanark saw little hope in colonization schemes except as they might be based on religious grounds; the Shaker settlement at New Lebanon, Pennsylvania seemed to point the way to him in the late fall of 1845.[81] On the other hand, his son, erstwhile associate of Frances Wright and friend of a dozen reform movements, immersed now in Indiana and national politics, continued on cordial terms with Warren, but his interest in the latter's social experimentation no longer prevailed. A more practical phase of Warren's activity now furnished the attraction to Owen, his never-ceasing researches in the fundamentals of printing.

Turning from presses to type faces, he brought out two small volumes in 1844 which made use of a revived interest in an early eighteenth century stereotyping process.[82] This involved the substitution of a composition of unusual hardness in the place of metal, which reduced printing costs markedly and furthered the contest with publishers in general.[83] These pioneer booklets, which sought to revolutionize the system of musical notation and thereby enable aspiring musicians to reduce the expense and duration of training, met no better fate than any of his other earlier accomplishments, other than to further the development of what he later designated as "Universal Typography."[84]

---

[78] Warren to Maria and Thomas Varney, February 16, 1847, reprinted in *Practical Details,* 104.

[79] Warren to Maria and Thomas Varney, February 7, 1847, reprinted in *Practical Details,* 100.

[80] Warren to Maria and Thomas Varney, April 25, 1847, reprinted in *Practical Details,* 115.

[81] *Indiana Statesman,* December 6, 1845, quoting from a dispatch originally printed in *Young America* describing Owen's personal reactions to the status of community life in America, after a trip which included most of the prominent settlements actually in existence.

[82] The old clay cast method was employed in constructing the stereotype plate, and the substitution of a mixture of shellac, tar and sand for type metal was an unusual departure. Still another mixture, consisting of clay, sand, beeswax, tallow, oil, gum arabic and stearine for the purpose of making fine-surface engravings was also perfected at this time. For a comparison with the earlier stereotyping devices, see Thomas Hodgson, *An Essay on the Origin and Progress of Stereotype Printing* (Newcastle, England, 1820), 13-14; Theodore L. De Vinne, *Printing in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1924), 6; *New Harmony Gazette,* I, 255, the latter for a description of the Lanefelder process developed in Austria in 1826, which aroused the attention of the Owenites while Warren was a member of the community.

Warren compromised his principles in respect to previous unyielding theoretical opposition to patents. At the urging of Owen's sons and his old friend, the midwestern scientific agricultural pioneer Solon Robinson, the process was patented in the spring of 1845.[85] Robinson not only brought the documents to the Patent Office at this time, but acted as agent for Warren. While travelling through the Midwest, he publicized its merits, which were recognized by editors with whom he came in contact all along the Ohio.[86] The inventor himself illustrated his ability as an engraver with numerous examples of his artistry, several of which embellished the heretofore stark pages of New Harmony's weekly journal.[87]

Regardless of patent protection and the attendant publicity, no attempt was made to plumb the commercial possibilities of the composition cast method of stereotyping. To Warren it meant more as an opportunity to expand his own printing activities, especially in broadcasting

---

83. A full description of the compositions involved can be found in Kubler, *History of Stereotyping,* 301.
84. Warren's first work, *A New System of Musical Notation,* published in New Harmony, was closely followed by the other that same year, *A Collection of the Most Popular Church Music Written Upon Geometric or Scientific Principles,* a group of excerpts from 56 popular church hymns of the 1840's printed in a form adapted for use by brass bands. Speaking of his father's innovation, George Warren, himself a widely known band leader in southern Indiana in later years, explained, "He dispensed with the sharp and flat signatures, and the tier and length of the stem gave the length of the note, and the piano or forte power was designated by the size of the note itself." "Josiah Warren," 4-5.
85. Patent No. 4479 on "Composition for Stereotype Plates" was issued to Warren on April 25, 1846. C. S. Partridge, *Stereotyping the Papier Maché Process* (Chicago, 1892), 130. A certified copy of this patent, signed and sealed by Thomas Eubank, Commissioner of Patents, August 26, 1850, is in the Warren MSS. in the Workingmen's Institute Library.
86. Herbert A. Kellar, *Solon Robinson Pioneer and Agriculturist* (Indiana Historical *Collections,* vol. XXI) (2 vols. Indianapolis, 1936), II, 504-507. For references to Warren's process in other papers see *Prairie Farmer,* V (June, 1845), 155-156; *Daily Cincinnati Gazette,* July 23, July 30, 1845; *Indiana Statesman,* July 26, September 13, September 20, October 4, 1845, the latter issues also carrying reprints from articles on this subject in the *New York Sun, New York Morning News, Vincennes* (Ind.) *Gazette* and *Princeton* (Ind.) *Chronicle.* Other notices appeared from time to time in other stopping-off places along Robinson's route, including Evansville, and Shawneetown, Illinois.
87. *Indiana Statesman,* July 4, August 16, October 11, December 27, 1845; January 31, February 14, 1846. The cut in the last issue cited was a superb five column spread, eight inches high, of the map of the disputed Oregon Territory.

the message of equitable commerce. Since he had contemplated for some time publishing a comprehensive summary of his philosophy and explorations in social matters, it now was possible to fulfill these aspirations with a minimum of expense. Despite the interruptions caused by the handicaps of working without help in an endeavor where the benefits of division of labor were obvious, the work persevered. The difficulties were not all mechanical; Warren was not a literary man, and wrote painfully, in a simple but often stilted style, which was further burdened by a somewhat archaic vocabulary, even in the estimate of his contemporaries.[88] The final product of two years of collation and revision of a mass of notes taken sporadically for almost twenty years, all its imperfections considered, was a document of undeniable simplicity. Published in April, 1847,[89] Josiah Warren's *Equitable Commerce* became the first important publication of anarchist doctrine in America, and with minor deletions, additions and revisions, went into more editions within the next thirty years than any other product of native anarchist thought to this time.[90]

Equitable Commerce as an expression of social discontent catches much of the flavor of the world-wide revolt sentiment of the mid-nineteenth century. In an apocalyptic discourse reminiscent of, but anticipating Marx's *Communist Manifesto,* Warren also looked out upon a civilization approaching a revolutionary crisis, but with the battle lines being drawn on a broad parasite-producer rather than the more limited capitalist-industrial worker line:[91]

> Society has been in a state of violence, of revolution and suffering, ever since its first formation; and at this moment, the greatest number are

---

[88] One of Waren's interesting controversies was that carried on with the editor of the *Indiana Statesman*, during the time following the closing of the New Harmony time store. Although he respected Warren as a technical innovator in the printing and engraving field, Burns refused to print his articles on the labor exchange, calling them "long-winded stories," and marvelling that in the obscurity Warren was able to develop any kind of a clearly expressed idea. *Indiana Statesman,* February 15, 1845.

[89] The title page carried the date 1846 as the date of publication. All citations below are from this rare original edition unless otherwise noted. A selection from this edition is included in Irving Mark and Eugene L. Schwab, (eds.), *The Faith of Our Fathers; An Anthology of Americana, 1790-1860* (New York, 1952), 380-384.

[90] A second edition appeared in 1849 while Warren was at "Utopia" (Smith's Landing), Ohio, while a third was published in New York in 1852. A slightly altered version, with the addition of an editor's preface and a different appendix, under the title *True Civilization: A Subject of Vital and Serious Interest to All People but Most Immediately to Men and Women of Labor and Sorrow,* printed under Warren's direction in Cliftondale, Mass., in 1869, became the fourth appearance of this work. The fifth edition, posthumously released by Benjamin Tucker at Princeton, Mass., in 1875 bore the same title and content as the 1869 edition. Other Warren works incorporated the first two words of the title of this latter version, which has been the cause of a considerable amount of confusion among bibliographers.

[91] *Equitable Commerce,* introduction, iii.

> about to array themselves against the smaller, who have, by some subtle and hidden means lived luxuriously upon their labor without rendering an equivalent. Governments have lost their power of governing by their own operations. Laws have become powerless from their inherent defectiveness and their iniquitous perversion. The grinding power of capital is everywhere felt to be irresistible by the ordinary means—the right of the strongest begins to be openly admitted to a frightful extent, and many of the best minds look forward to an age of confusion and violence, with the confidence of despair. The cry of misery and the call for remedy are heard from all quarters.

The Warrenite program, however, discarded familiar reform interpretations and solutions, all varieties of collectivism, paternalism, violent revolutionary and political action. Elaborating on some of the ideas already expressed in other writings and further confirmed by experience and convictions produced thereby, he launched a delineation of the individualist stand on the proper reward of labor, security of personal property and freedom of the individual.[92] Summed up in the two slogans "Sovereignty of the Individual" and "Cost the Limit of Price," *Equitable Commerce* concentrated on preparing a case for this kind of individualism. The belief in the absolute inviolability of the individual personality expressed in its pages placed him in a camp opposite from the advocates of reform through legislation or violence.

In Warren's estimation, liberty and security were complementary, not opposites; liberty was the foundation upon which security of both person and property rested, and as long as there was one insecure person, there was potential insecurity for all others.[93] This called for location in proper relation of power, which for each individual extended over his own person and property, and not beyond.[94] This was expected to result in the undermining of the structure of all authority obtained from any other source than that of voluntary grant. To admit boundless individuality in nature and then to create institutions requiring agreement contrary to one's will appeared the height of contradiction. Personal differences were an inseparable part of the individual personality, which he refused to see by-passed in the "pursuit of policy and expediency."[95] On this basis he rejected institutional activity which ultimately depended upon compliance on the part of the members unable to see it conducive to their best interests to do so, or which compromised them by demanding conformity as the price for favors allegedly furnished.[96]

---

[92] The five basic principles of the Warrenite community were re-phrased a number of times, receiving their most concise statement in 1863:

"Individuality is the great cornerstone of order.
Self-sovereignty is the mandate of peace.
The principle of equivalents is the element of equilibrium or pecuniary justice, and the harmonizer of pecuniary interests.
The equitable circulating medium is an instrument necessary to the working of the principle of equivalents.
Adaptation of supplies to wants or demands is necessary in all departments." *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 182.

[93] *Equitable Commerce,* 10.

[94] "The security of person and property requires that each and every individual should be the supreme law to himself and his own. That one should have no power over another's person or property." *Equitable Commerce,* 24.

In the vein of his earlier writings on law, Warren continued to castigate legislation as one aspect of this denial of individual freedom. He objected particularly to the demand of unconditional fealty from all, enthusiastic or hesitant, to the wishes of the larger number.[97] Warren saw no virtue in majorities; to him right was not a quantitative matter to be determined by sheer numbers.[98] Should a thing be an evil when espoused by a few, the support of a larger number at a later time did not automatically change its nature, making what had been reprehensible now respectable and desirable. He refused to consider the manipulation of verbal symbols "laws" in the same sense:[99]

> Words are the tenure by which everything is held by law, and words are subject to different interpretations, according to the views, wills, or interests of the judges, juries, and other functionaries appointed to execute these laws. In this uncertainty of interpretation lies the great fundamental element of insecurity. . . . No language is fit for any such purposes that admits of more than one individual interpretation, and none can be made to possess this necessary individuality; therefore no language is fit for the basis of human institutions. To possess the interpretating power of verbal institutions is to possess unlimited power.

Warren thus attached to law, by virtue of its perpetual uncertainty, the blame for the great majority of crimes. Statute law could hardly be expected to do anything except aggravate and expand the diseases of society over a larger area.[100] Warren scorned the explanation of laws and government by political theorists who sought to relate them to reality as manifestations of a common desire for the protection of life and possessions. He refused to believe that human history revealed such realization, and was convinced that the state had failed in its basic mission in providing protection for its citizens.[101] What was worse, in his mind, was the effect of the governing process, which had been precipitated into a struggle for control of the governing privilege. This was the result, he explained, of the discovery that in an environment characterized by insecurity, the least insecure were the persons who were successful in obtaining control of the governing power.[102] Thus rulers and ruling groups, protected temporarily by virtue of holding power, punished crimes by death and imprisonment without realizing that these were consequences of their own acts. The increasing complexity of laws and lawmaking succeeded in increasing the volume of violations rather than producing the security of the society which they purported to represent.[103] On still another level, there was the spectacle of a government involving its citizens in group responsibilities from which many may have preferred to remain apart, and in extreme situations, such as wars,[104] compelling them to desert their own interests and even die without recourse of any sort.

---

[95] Warren believed that the fact that human beings were characterized by individual peculiarities and that it still was acknowledged and remained "unsmothered" made this the starting place for what he termed the "ascent towards order and harmony." *Equitable Commerce,* 4.

[96] *Equitable Commerce,* 4-5.

[97] *Equitable Commerce,* 7.

[98] Warren averred that the term "sovereignty of the people" could mean nothing else except the sovereignty of each individual; "Where is the sovereignty of a people when the sovereignty of every individual is surrendered to votes of majorities, or to a few men appointed to interpret and administer laws and institutions?" *Practical Details,* 40.

[99] *Equitable Commerce,* 23.

[100] Warren was unconvinced that statute law had produced any decline in the number of violent crimes. He inveighed against capital punishment for murder as just another variety of murder, an act which did not perform the function of a deterrent to fresh crimes of the same type. *Equitable Commerce,* 22.

Warren proposed a solution which dispensed with government other than that of each person over himself; ". . . never shall man know liberty until each and every individual is acknowledged to be the only legitimate sovereign of his or her person, time and property, each living and acting at his own cost; . . . The only ground upon which man can know liberty is that of disconnection, disunion, individuality."[105] American radical writing has few expressions which match the determination found in this piece of anti-statist literature, even though the complexity of human relationships in modern urban industrial society make its message of separation of interests sound of little use or pertinence. Other than this course, Warren predicted, would only increase conflicts and consequently would require more direction from the "outside," more mediation, more intervention, which he termed "government."[106]

---

[101] Warren accused governments of having been responsible for more bloodshed and violence throughout history than could have possibly occurred in the absence of all governments. The indictment of government as an agent of destruction and mass murder has become a much-repeated anarchist arraignment in almost every land which has developed an anarchist press. *Equitable Commerce,* 19.

[102] *Equitable Commerce,* 22, 24.

[103] ". . . neither rulers nor ruled can tell how the laws will be interpreted or administered till they have been repeatedly infringed and punishment has been inflicted," Warren observed, seeking to discover the precise moment when law began to disintegrate. *Equitable Commerce,* 20.

[104] Wars he described as "probably the greatest of all destroyers of property," and professed to be able to find only two roots from which all wars had originated; "direct or indirect plunder" and "the privilege of governing." Warren denied the right of any government to force its citizens to fight against their will. *Equitable Commerce,* 21, 44.

[105] *Equitable Commerce,* 27-28. The right to complete individual freedom, according to Warrenite principle, was qualified only by the responsibility of each to respect the individuality of each. Infringement of another's sovereignty carried with it all consequences of such action. Warren believed that a harmonious society was impossible unless each member became individually responsible for his acts. The similarity of Warren and Herbert Spencer's later "law of equal freedom" can be detected at this point, despite the divergent points of origin.

The next part of the exposition of the ideal equitable society described the process whereby the aims of the individual and the needs of society were to be blended. The dog-eat-dog kind of "individualism" Warren saw all about him caused him considerable concern. His aim was to avoid the initiative-destroying propensities of the community of property, with which he was all too familiar.[107] Keeping in mind physical and intellectual variables present among persons, he built up his version of an economy geared to a system of exchanges which used the labor cost of production as its sole guide.[108] He proposed an economic structure consisting of producing members, acting either alone or in groups organized entirely on the principle of voluntary cooperation to make the most from the known advantages of division of labor. In all cases there was to be full individual responsibility, a condition to be arrived at by agreement where more than one person was involved. Only under such circumstances would it be possible for a group to live socially without the committal of powers of decision into the hands of an arbiter, judge, politician or other representative of outside agency claiming to operate in the interests of the group, in which he included the churches.[109] No halfway process would be of any avail, because it was impossible to surrender a definite quantity of one's liberty. Once erected, a government always tended to encroach upon what it did not control, due to its control over the interpretation of the language which delegated the powers it first obtained.[110]

The way of life which Warren sought to inaugurate according to *Equitable Commerce* incorporated a number of considerations which were bound to make the entire project unpalatable to most of the affluent and comfortable members of society among his readers, and to all those with ambitions of carving out for themselves a higher position in the existing order. The ultimate re-organization of society on the basis of decentralized local communities in which the needs and capabilities of all might be readily learned,[111] was expected to lead to the circumvention of political boundaries and the placing of all inter-community relations on a voluntary level as well.[112] It was assumed that community services would be supplied in a superior manner by individuals who contracted to furnish them when called for by those who wanted and paid for such conveniences.[113] Warren mentioned nothing concerning the problem of inter-community transportation and communication. Furthermore, this system was predicated on the theory that there was an optimum community size, following the attainment of which it was expected that additional communities would develop nearby to the parent. In developing this matter, Warren appeared to be thinking in terms of the experiences of the last year at New Harmony during its Owenite phase, although Owen himself had stated before New Harmony the necessity of limiting the size of the community.[114]

---

[106] Warren made no distinction between "government" and "state" as the classic anarchist writers of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries have generally done; a connotation of voluntarism has been imparted to the former and coercion to the latter of these terms.

[107] *Equitable Commerce,* 30-31.

[108] *Equitable Commerce,* 25, 28. There is no existing evidence that Warren at any time was a believer in biological or racial inequality.

[109] Equitable Commerce, 16, 41-42. It is important to observe the change in Warren's attitude toward organized religion in the twenty years between the first time store and the publication of the first summary of his social philosophy. Once non-committal, he now classed all churchmen as non-producers with a personal interest in the preservation of the existing order.

[110] *Equitable Commerce,* 27, 31.

One of the primary requirements of the self-sufficient society was his insistence on the decentralization of manufactures, to be confined to the production for satisfaction of local needs exclusively. Among other things, this was considered beneficial in order to fix responsibility for the utility and quality of the products, which were variables over which consumers in a profit economy far removed from the site of production had practically no control.[115]

With respect to machinery, the position taken in some ways anticipated Henry George. Warren did not look upon it as a separate factor of production, but merely a combination of the two he recognized, land, or raw materials, and the labor which went into its production. The combined labor of producing the materials incorporated in the machine, in addition to that needed to construct the machine itself equalled what he called the "cost" of the machine, and belonged to the laborers and inventors who conceived and built it. Machinery was a social benefaction only so long as it made products available priced to consumers in terms of cost of production. The displacement of labor resulting from the introduction of machinery might seek employment in other activities not yet fully mechanized, having benefited from the cheapened product now resulting from the technological innovation.[116] Warren looked forward to a future work day of two or three hours through the abolition of craft monopolies and the social sharing of the benefits of machine production.[117] He did not believe that needs were indefinitely expansible, and thought that if technical production was geared to needs, there would be none of the pernicious effects of speculative manufacture with its disastrous accompaniments of "over-production" and subsequent destruction for the purpose of preserving price levels.

---

[111] *Equitable Commerce,* 34. Warren intimated that the existing basis of the "present" system of exchanges was more ideological than scientific, unworthy of satisfactory apology or incapable of prolonged resistance to an opposing system.

[112] Warren admitted that his idea of individual sovereignty would produce chaos if attempts were made to force it to function within the national state system, but he believed that it would prove successful in a world lacking national consciousness. *Equitable Commerce,* 24.

[113] *Equitable Commerce,* 26.

[114] *Equitable Commerce,* 67. The *MacDonald Diaries* reveal that Owen suggested a maximum community population of about 2000 while on board ship bound for America in the fall of 1824.

[115] Thus he gave voice to the complaint of the bilked consumer everywhere; ". . . there is scarcely an article of food, clothing, tools, or medicines that is fit for use . . . the vender does not make them but imports them beyond the reach of responsibility." *Equitable Commerce,* 42-43.

Warren's opposition to the private ownership of machinery on the basis of a patent monopoly or any other contingency except actual construction was no more resolute than his opposition to the acquisition of land for speculative purposes.[118] While fifteen years before he had questioned land titles themselves, he now was willing to accept the prevailing division, providing all land sales subsequent to the original purchase involved no addition to what he called the "prime cost" beyond expenses resulting from surveying, drawing up of contracts, and even taxes,[119] to which there was no expression of resistance, a remarkable concession.

Equitable Commerce contained the now-familiar exposition of the labor note currency, with variations resulting from discrepancies which previous trial now exposed. Warren sought to solve the problem caused by the refusal of some members in his previous labor exchange to participate in accepting similar amounts of any member's time. This came as a result of his declaration that work of greatest repugnance was worthy of the highest remuneration, since distastefulness must be considered one of the elements of "cost" if anyone was to perform the unpleasant tasks in a non-coercive society.[120] It was felt that the undermining of this principle destroyed the whole basis of the labor exchange plan. Another novelty in the statement of the labor notes bore on the issue created by persons with different evaluations of labor time. Although Warren had repudiated gold and silver and all other commodity-backed moneys as inferior to the direct matching of labor for labor, in *Equitable Commerce* he decided that there should be an alternative to the acceptance of the actual labor of the person presenting any given

---

116. *Equitable Commerce,* 11-12, 17, 40-41, 45. Warren's conception of machines was not as producers of unemployment but as reducers of the work day for all and social engines whose output should be shared on an equitable plan.

117. *Equitable Commerce,* 41-42.

118. *Equitable Commerce,* 16-17. His opposition to the taking of interest on money was as rigid as to the stand on rent.

119. *Equitable Commerce,* 44-45. The occupation-and-use concept of land was a product of later theorists in the individualist anarchist group.

120. "We must admit the claims of the hardest labor to the highest reward, or we deny our own rights, extinguish the little light we have obtained, and throw everything back into confusion." *Equitable Commerce,* 52.

note. This resulted in the concession to back the labor currency with "Indian" corn, which was judged to be superior to metals with respect to ease of determining its cost of production in man hours.[121] All subsequent labor notes bore guarantees of payment in a number of pounds of corn.

The latter portion of *Equitable Commerce* is devoted to a description of the steps to be taken in forming an equitist village, which Warren believed the most important part. Yet his work is best remembered as the earliest document of importance in the definition of individualist anarchism along theoretical and intellectual lines. The limited edition of this work no doubt set the boundaries of its contemporary influence, a matter which is still quite difficult to determine. Whereas the devotion to the ideal of complete individual autonomy may have struck responsive notes in a number of circles, it is doubtful if in the United States of the late 1840's, with territorial expansion, war and the slavery controversy occupying most of the stage, that there was an area of receptiveness for the supra-nationalism, the bitter institutional criticism and the economic propositions contained in this slim volume.

Warren had no intention of creating a sensational incident and a focus for violent language by placing his ideas and the results of his investigations and experiences within the perusing reach of those with polemical predispositions. The concluding pages had a note of abdication on his part in the event of such incidence, which in many ways was the index of Warren's personality and a source of criticism at a later time:[122]

> I decline all noisy, wordy, confused and personal controversies. This subject is presented for calm study, and honest inquiry; and after having placed it fairly before the public, I shall leave it to be estimated by each individual according to the particular measure of his understanding, and shall offer no violence to his individuality, by any attempt to restrain, or to urge him beyond it.

Far from having leisure to engage in recrimination, at the time the book was completed he was already involved in fresh activity preparatory to resuming community life experimentation. The resumption of relations with old acquaintances and sympathizers in the Cincinnati area gave promise of some support, for the first time, from enough persons to make the organization and operation of a labor exchange village more hopeful of success than ever before.

---

121. *Equitable Commerce,* 77.
122. *Equitable Commerce,* 75.

CHAPTER III

The Colonial Period: "Utopia" and "Modern Times"

I

The middle and late 1840's saw the collapse of the most numerous and the most ambitious of all the attempts of a non-political nature made toward producing socio-economic reform in American history. The intellectual revolt against social convention and the economic status quo, spearheaded by a restless intelligentsia, expressed itself during this time in practical adventures in the socialism of Charles Fourier[1] and his brilliant associate Victor Considérant.[2] The successors to the Owenites of the two previous decades, Fourierite colonies experienced a similar rise, popularity and eclipse,[3] surpassing their predecessors both in the meteoric nature of their rise and the abruptness of their decline.

Josiah Warren, a keen student of Fourierism, found it objectionable on a number of counts. Joint stock capitalization, community of property arrangements, reliance on altruism as the source of motivation for the performance of the distasteful tasks of the group, these and the dilution of responsibility, on which he placed much blame for the reduction of the New Harmony Community of Equality, were his principal indictments of the socialist phalansteries. Convinced that this furious activity was a mistake, Warren determined to wait out its complete dissipation in New Harmony,[4] but other factors intervened. Attempts to obtain land for a new village had been made in the vicinity of Cincinnati during the early part of 1847, without definite results.[5] Other independent actions being equally indecisive, the opportunity came once more from the termination of a rival enterprise, as the Tuscarawas community had grown from the remnants of Spring Hill previously.

---

[1] The word "socialism" meant many things to different persons in the mid-nineteenth century as it has continued to do in our own time. Albert Brisbane, one of the great intellectuals of the Fourierite group, evinced considerable admiration for the French anarchist Proudhon, at one time declaring that he was the beginner of "modern Socialism." Redelia Brisbane, *Albert Brisbane,* 292-294. The continuing expansion of the definition of socialism in the present time can be seen for example in James Burnham, *The Managerial Revolution* (New York, 1941), Chapters IX, XIV and XV, and Lawrence Dennis, *The Dynamics of War and Revolution* (New York, 1940), xx-xxxi. See Introduction, Note 1.

[2] From the point of view of anarchists, the significance of Considérant as a propagandist in the socialist cause has been singularly overlooked. See especially Chapter X, "The Origin of the 'Manifesto of the Communist Party,' " in W. Tcherkesoff, *Pages of Socialist History* (New York, 1902), 55-66, for an interesting comparison of the Marxian document with Considérant's *Principes du Socialisme: Manifeste de la Democratie au Dixneuviéme Siecle,* first published in Paris in 1843. Tcherkesoff here presents the anarchist case in accusing Marx and Engels of extensive plagiarism from Considérant. Using the parallel text method, Tcherkesoff finds Marx guilty of paraphrasing numerous passages and retaining the form and titles of a number of the same chapters. An interesting interpretation of the Considérant-Marx matter can be found in Max Nomad, *Apostles of Revolution* (London, 1939), 90-91.

[3] In a contemporary observation Warren remarked, "The average duration of the experiments of community of property and of the Fourierist Phalanxes is about two years, or two and a half." *Practical Details,* 89. See also the short objective summary of Fourierite activity in Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment,* 217-220.

In November of the previous year the Clermont Phalanx, one of the largest and most promising of the Fourierite settlements which had been located about thirty miles up the Ohio from Cincinnati, suddenly collapsed. As often happened in other similar cases, the land and property of the group fell into the hands of the principal stockholders. Most of the members of the phalanx returned to Cincinnati, where the whole project had been born, but a sufficient number of enthusiasts remained to preserve hope in the eventual success of some type of community life. Much of the land was bought by a communal group led by three veterans in settlements of this nature, John O. Wattles, John P. Cornell and Hiram S. Gilmore, who began the construction along Owenite lines. A community building, partially inspired by the several similar structures of Rappite origin at New Harmony and intended for the accommodation of six families, was built on the site of the former location, but the attempt did not prosper.[6] A small number of the earlier group also persevered, living on a piece of communally-held land, where they were visited by Warren in June, 1847 while occupied in discussions as to future action. If he had acquired a measure of recognition as an inventor, the individualist was even better known among community people, no less among those who expressed distaste for his theories. The Fourierites spoke of him as "a man of no ordinary talents," and the success of his practical experimentation had given him the reputation of being a man of action as well as a theoretician.

Warren was successful in prevailing upon the ex-phalansterians to take up the cost-price individualist variety of decentralization. Shortly thereafter[7] the second essay in anarchist community life, variously known as "Utopia" and "Trialville," was begun on a tract of land on the bank of the Ohio River about a mile from the site of the Clermont Phalanx. The labor exchange ideal prevailed from the beginning. The owner of the land, an ex-member of the previous group named Jernegan, was induced to set aside a portion for a townsite. Streets and alleys were surveyed and laid out, while 80 quarter acre lots for home building constituted the initial physical extent of the projected new community. These lots were placed on sale to prospective settlers at a fixed price of fifteen dollars each, which included the cost of the surveying. A contract calling for the continuation of this price policy until all lots were sold, and lasting for at least three years in event of any circumstances, was signed at this time. Purchasers were restricted by agreement to not more than two lots. Renewals of the price agreement were made periodically, Warren reporting after a visit to the village nine years after its commencement that lots were still being sold to new settlers at "prime cost."[8] Admissions to the colony after the first gathering were made upon invitation by one of these first residents, in accordance with Warren's declaration that the most precious element of personal liberty was "the liberty to choose our associates at all times." It was hoped that in this manner the intrusion of "disturbers" would be checked, and that persons impelled "to inculcate any particular beliefs or *Isms* of any kind against the voluntary inclination of others would . . . find themselves . . . disagreeably situated."[9] Warren made a distinction between trouble makers and holders of divergent opinions, since conformity was neither expected nor desired; "differences . . . are a valuable part of our harmony." This attempt to filter out proponents of other ideas than equitable commerce, relatively successful at "Utopia," was to break down completely at "Modern Times" ten years later. There the efforts of varied reform protagonists all but scuttled the economic experiments.

---

[4] *Practical Details,* 57.

[5] *Practical Details,* 93-94; Warren to Maria and Thomas Varney, February 27, 1847, in *Practical Details,* 111; Nettlau, *Der Vorfrühling,* 110.

[6] John Humphrey Noyes, the first chronicler of the happenings following the collapse of the Clermont Phalanx, misinterpreted sources and is responsible for contributing the impression that this small community group was the nucleus of the individualist colony, which developed independently a few months later.

Four families became the original core of the new town, and were able, by exchanging labor, to build satisfactory homes "before Christmas." An associate of Warren's, Daniel Prescott, began the construction of a brick kiln and yard, while some building stone was cut in the vicinity and lumber cut and carried to the building site. The small knot of disillusioned and nearly impoverished Fourierites who composed the group found themselves in far better economic position upon taking stock late the following spring. Nearly two dozen families occupied the site, most of whom were already living in their own houses. Warren noted that no one had moved away since the beginning. Prescott had taken the initiative in constructing a saw and grist mill, while Warren developed a "printing office" in a portion of the former's large brick house and began printing the *Peaceful Revolutionist* once more.[10]

---

[7] According to Noyes' account the community began in September, while Warren set the date of the laying out of the town in July. *The Harbinger,* October 2, 1847, quoted in Noyes, *American Socialisms,* 374-375; Warren, *Practical Applications,* 9.

[8] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* II (May, 1848), 4; *Periodical Letter,* II, 42-43.

[9] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* II (May, 1848), 16.

The first issue of the paper contained detailed accounts of the cost in money and labor which attended the first ten months of construction, and letters from enthusiastic settlers describing their satisfaction with affairs up to that time. Wrote E. G. Cubberley:[11]

> I was in the Clermont Phalanx nearly three years, and paid in two hundred and seven dollars; and worked hard all the time, with not the best of eatables either; and at the end of the time I found myself rather badly situated—No money, no good clothes, no tools to commence work with, no any thing. . . . Last July, when Mr. Jernegan had this town laid out, I thought I would buy a lot and . . . be gathering materials through the winter, for building on it in the spring . . . on enquiry of those who had the brick, lumber, etc. I found I could exchange my labor for theirs. . . . I have now got a brick house, one story and a half high, sixteen by eighteen feet. . . . I borrowed twenty six dollars to commence my business with, and paid all that and had thirty dollars left. I now have a house and lot, and all I owe on it is two dollars and seventy nine in money, and about four days labor. I feel now that I am a whole individual—not a piece of a mass, or of somebody else, as I was in combination.

The "Jack of all trades" role was promoted among the settlers, with the desire being to create and develop all the needed skills among the residents that "heads and hands" might be employed "according to the demand." When the need for a particular skill temporarily ceased, Warren maintained it was "absolutely necessary" that persons thus trained seek "full employment" in another way; "he is ten times a citizen who can perform a citizen's part in ten different positions; and more than this, when he is ready and willing to teach others to be as useful as himself."[12]

The labor note currency was adopted, and a time store selling basic merchandise at the usual drastically reduced prices found the same support from its patrons and aroused the customary resentment among merchants.[13] Warren began his music training school once more on the labor exchange basis, with no conventional currency transactions and with children as young as nine years of age participating. His summary of the prevailing situation at "Utopia" in the spring of 1848 is a recital of material and spiritual gains which would have gladdened the heart of any individual anarchist half a century later:[14]

---

[10] The date given for the renewal of publication stated by Noyes as 1845 is obviously in error, in view of the fact that the colony did not start until two years later. The mistake has been perpetuated by anarchist bibliographers ever since, facilitated by the fact that issues of the paper are particularly rare. See Noyes, *American Socialisms,* 98-99; Stammhammer, *Bibliographie,* II, 345; Nettlau, *Bibliographie,* 6.

[11] E. G. Cubberley to Josiah Warren, April 10, 1848, in *Peaceful Revolutionist,* II (May, 1848), 10-11.

[12] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* II (May, 1848), 8-9.

[13] Witness Warren's humor on this point: "Straws are often better to show which way the wind blows than the most labored invention. I cannot give a better sign of progress, than that a store-o-crat in the neighborhood says

> Throughout the whole of our operations on the ground, everything has been conducted so nearly upon the Individual basis that not one meeting for legislation has taken place. No Organization, no indefinite delegated power, no "Constitutions," no "laws" or "bye laws," "rules" or "regulations" but such as each individual makes for himself and his own business. No officers, no priests nor prophets have been resorted to—nothing of either kind has been in demand. We have had a few meetings, but they were for friendly conversation, for music, dancing or some other social and pleasant pastime. Not even a single lecture upon the principles upon which we were acting has been given on the premises! It was not necessary; for (as a lady remarked yesterday) "the subject once stated and understood, there is nothing left to talk about"—All is action after that.

Warren went on to say that rights of person and property prevailing in the community existed by grace of and were defined by "public opinion," in essence a re-affirmation of his belief in the superiority of common law over statute law as a guide for human affairs. Judgments on what he termed "mere differences of opinion" in all other relationships were left to "the supreme decision of each individual," operating under the understanding that responsibility, or "cost," was an integral part of any act on the part of mature individuals. Failure to assume responsibility for acts placed the person in the same category as minor children, but nothing was said as to how such delinquency was dealt with at "Utopia."

"Utopia" not only was a community without a formal government; it also persevered without the presence of a patriarch and escaped the

---

we 'must be stopped.' I suppose he has heard of Calicoes being sold here on the *Cost* principle for eleven cents a yard similar in quality to those often sold for twenty cents. It seems that his *public spirit* has taken the alarm—he cannot permit the *public* to be so imposed on; threatens us with law (for the protection of person and property) on account of issuing Labor Notes as a circulating medium." *Peaceful Revolutionist,* II (May, 1848), 11.

[14] *Peaceful Revolutionist,* II (May, 1848), 5. The substance of this quotation may be found under "A Peep Into Utopia," in Noyes, *American Socialisms,* 99, with source not indicated. There are over twenty errors in transmission if reproduction is from the material first printed in the contemporary *Peaceful Revolutionist.* This issue contained other materials besides community affairs. Warren commented favorably on the passage in New York and elsewhere of statutes guaranteeing women personal property rights independent of their husbands. He also wrote an extended commentary headed "Revolution" in which were summarized his attitudes toward the wave of political revolution then sweeping Europe, which he looked upon with sympathy but felt sure would "end in defeat and disappointment."

general fate which fell to those whose fortunes were inextricably interwoven with those of a dominant leader. Sensitive to criticism and troubled at this time by discussions elsewhere as to the credit for originality of the principles of "equitable commerce," it became Warren's conviction that his personality stood in the way of the growth of the movement. Shortly before leaving "Utopia" he declared, "I have a thousand times felt that if this subject had originated with someone who was dead I could have done perhaps a thousand times more for it." Restless as ever, he left when the venture was hardly more than a year old,[15] placing the little band of pioneers in anarchist decentralism entirely upon their own devices. The spirit of Warrenism remained there for a quarter of a century, however. In 1849, Amos E. Senter published a second edition of his *Equitable Commerce* on the grounds,[16] and by the end of the following year most of Warren's economic teachings had become part of the life of the gathering of individualists.

The residents of "Utopia" wasted no time in fruitless wrangling over differences of opinion connected with Warren's cost economy. Where critics aimed such shafts as the impossibility of determining the absolute accuracy of the labor hour as a medium of exchange, the small group of adherents preferred to work out a practical compromise. By the end of 1851, including the three other experiments where the mutual labor exchange had been introduced, several thousand people had participated. Two contemporary observations summarizing the results of this varied interchange of labor notes give some evidence of the degree of advancement toward a realization of their objective. When the decision was made to adopt corn as a medium of exchange at the rate of 20 pounds to the hour as an alternative to supplying the actual labor, a suspicion set in that disorder would result due to wildly fluctuating extremes. An examination of the labor notes indicated that the variation from the 20 pound yard stick was a third above or below this figure, reflecting changing costs of production which were expected to alter all labor notes payable only in hours of labor as well. In a number of other aspects of economic life at "Utopia," several products found the "general level" which Warren claimed earlier would occur as a result of the action of

---

[15] See Warren's manuscript notebook "D" for entry dated August 18, 1848, while in Boston. Warren remained here until the latter part of April, 1849, lecturing upon various phases of the principles in practice at "Utopia." See note 26, below.

[16] Senter was a resident of the community, producing the new edition in Warren's absence in February, 1848, before joining Warren in the spring. The two protagonists returned to "Utopia" in May of the same year, after conducting a lecture tour which included Pittsburgh. *Boston Investigator,* March 7, May 16, 1849.

The 1849 edition of *Equitable Commerce* contained facsimiles of the new labor notes calling for alternative redemption in 20 pounds of corn per hour, probably the first instance of the revelation of this new arrangement to the general public.

"public opinion." It is more likely that the determining factor was the existing pattern of technical learning and the stage of machine production which the colony tended to become adapted to.

The labor exchange as it worked here is quite illuminating, nevertheless. With respect to agricultural products, the customary price for wheat became six hours to the bushel, milk settled to ten minutes per quart, while eggs remained undisturbed at twenty minutes a dozen. Some manufactured goods also became "fixed"; shoes varied from three to nine hours, depending on the quality, with eighteen hours the figure for boots.[17] Still it was expected that the labor price would always be subject to change as new production methods were introduced, with the expectation that such changes would work for the increase of the volume of goods per hour of time expended in production, a gain for every one in the community. There was a choice for the producer as well, however, in all this. The individual might choose increased prosperity for increased work, or a shortened work day if he had more modest material ambitions. In either case, the decision was to be made with the understanding that the consequences were to be borne by the individual concerned.[18]

The community at "Utopia" never became a large or prominent one at any time. In 1852 the total number of residents approached one hundred. Approximately twenty families were established on the grounds, and this situation remained practically unchanged during the next two years.[19] By the winter of 1854, few of the original lots remained for sale to new settlers. The activities of the residents by this time had become more and more industrial in nature. The mutualists operated several enterprises on the labor for labor basis, including a saw and grist mill, a steam mill adapted to a number of services, including corn grinding and the turning of both wood and iron products, as well as a carpenter shop. Most of the machinery in this latter building was powerdriven. The modest needs of the inhabitants found room for the services of three carpenters, two shoemakers, a glazier and a painter, while, despite the limited opportunity to practice the cost economy, enough vigor in the system prevailed to support two time stores.[20]

---

[17] Stephen Pearl Andrews, *The Science of Society,* (No. 2. Cost the Limit of Price: A Scientific Measure of Honesty in Trade, as One of the Fundamental Principles of the Social Problem), 159-161.

[18] Geared for an economy built upon individual craftsmen, primarily, the system did not imitate the communal plans even though it functioned on a cost exchange basis. The superior worker had the opportunity of receiving more hours for less, or he might, on the other hand, choose the increased leisure resulting from his having to work less.

[19] Article "Triallville (sic) and Modern Times," in *Chambers' Edinburgh Journal,* XVIII (December 18, 1852), 396.

[20] See letter from E. G. Cubberley describing the operation of the community in *Periodical Letter,* I, 74. He spoke of the place as "Trialville," the name by which interested observers in England knew it. The names of other residents as recorded by Warren were George Prescott, William Long, Henry

Warren considered "Utopia" a successful demonstration of all he had been asserting since his defection from Owenite socialism. In view of his later disappointments, this Ohio village was without doubt the outstanding example of decentralist social and economic principles in actual operating situations. His last visit, in the winter of 1855-56, was the occasion for an enthusiastic report to the public concerning its perseverance. "Utopia" by this time consisted of some forty buildings, about half of which were devoted to industrial purposes. Optimism radiated in the estimate of the accomplishments there:[21]

> . . . my visit to that little germ of Equitable society, now eight and a half years old, has given me higher hopes and expectations than I had before dared to entertain. It is not the display that the little group of buildings makes to the eye . . . but knowing the means by which these . . . have been acquired, and seeing that there the subject of Equity has had eight years and six months deep study and practical trial, and that from the beginning . . . the subject had lost nothing with those who first took hold of it . . . but had gained . . . from year to year in their highest judgment and affectionate regard.

The major energies of Warren and his associates had swung to the East by this time, however, where the more pretentious but less successful "Modern Times" was entering a critical period of its varying fortunes. Thus at the time the report of the success at "Utopia" was being made, the Ohio group was already becoming less and less prominent in the eyes of the other individualists, and practically disappeared from the thoughts and literature of the articulate individualist anarchist propaganda in a later generation. The impact of the Civil War and cheap lands westward had serious consequences for the little adventure in mutualism, as well as the prevailing policy of modesty with reference to publicity, which had a discouraging effect upon recruitment of additional settlers and potential converts.[22]

It is true that the experimental nature of "Utopia" precluded indiscriminate outside participation in its activities, a matter brought about by continual fear of widespread censure by moralists for harboring per-

---

B. Lyon, Martin Poor, Thomas Vater, a Mr. Francis and a Mr. Hemphill. Several others were designated by the initial of the family name only. *Practical Applications,* 11-16.

[21] *Periodical Letter,* II, 46. This represented an increase of fourteen buildings since late 1849. *Practical Applications,* 13.

[22] Warren favored migration into Illinois, but in groups so as to be able to bring the cost economy with them and thus avoid the three principal sources of exploitation colonists faced, land speculation, interest and lack of an available market. The real reason for the failure of the town to expand, he later related, was the fact that the lands surrounding the original settlement were in the hands of speculators who held out for such high prices that most of the early settlers left as a unit for Minnesota, after cheap land was opened up in this area. Their actual destination was never revealed. *Practical Applications,* 15; *Periodical Letter,* II, 42.

sons whose behavior might have been considered excessively unconventional.[23] In view of the apprehension of the general conservative mind, especially concerning divergence in matters of thought and action of sexual nature, the policy of allowing the first settlers to choose subsequent permanent residents was undoubtedly a wise one.

As late as 1875 a few of the original settlers still occupied portions of the area, which by now had become known as Smith's Landing. Occasional reports indicated that some of the business transacted by residents continued to be done on the labor exchange principle, and that despite the serious depression then prevailing in the nation at large, labor notes based on corn continued to be honored with little fluctuation from the first estimates made almost thirty years before.[24] "Utopia" in the more correct sense, however, had ceased being of significance in American social life at least a decade before. When approached from the point of view of Josiah Warren, who conceived the venture as a proving ground for principles and not as an attempt to revolutionize American civilization, it was a qualified success. In a reminiscence made eight months before his death he declared that the experiment "worked to our satisfaction."[25] It is in this matter of intention that the anarchist community differed from its allied and contemporary so-called "utopian" schemes; permanent survival at no time constituted a basic objective, at least as far as the settlements in question were concerned.

Warren nevertheless experienced a disappointment which was common among the reformers of mid-nineteenth century America. The faith in mere demonstration as a force sufficiently compelling to attract numerous followers can be found throughout the varied hues of the movement, accompanied by almost universal eventual rejection or unconcern. Warren's fond hope of numerous imitations of "Utopia" likewise foundered but not until the experiences of community life had been extended by the promise and dampened by the factionalism at "Modern Times."

II

In the summer of 1848, Warren returned to Boston, after an absence of almost thirty years. Such a move was no indication that he had given up the Midwest as a field for further propaganda and experimentation; in fact, he was back in New Harmony less than two years later.[26] It is probable that the intellectual stimulation provided by contact with many radical minds in the East, however, had much to do with the decision to combine efforts with friends and once more prepare for action on a project first proposed by Frances Wright and Robert Dale Owen in 1830, an individualist colony in the vicinity of New York City.

---

[23] See note 31, Introduction.

[24] See letters from E. G. Cubberley in *The Word,* III (May, 1874), 3; (September, 1874), 3; (June, 1875), 3.

[25] *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly,* September 9, 1871; *The Word,* II (July, 1873), 4.

[26] Warren's lecture series on the workings of "equitable commerce" lasted through most of the winter of 1849. See notices and reports in *Boston Investigator,* January 17, January 24, February 7, February 14, February 21, February 28, March 21, 1849. The New Harmony tax and census records for 1849 list both Warren and his wife as residents of the town. See also

In Boston he became acquainted with William B. Greene,[27] whose own branch of economic thought later became incorporated in anarchist financial theory. Association with the freethought movement provided occasions for lectures on equitable commerce to gatherings of this group, which contained diverse liberal and radical elements. It is probable that here he also developed his association with Stephen Pearl Andrews. Andrews, a prominent New York intellectual and veteran of several reform movements, became Warren's first important convert in the advocacy of decentralism and individualism. It was also in New York that Warren developed to a high degree his reputation as a lecturer before small groups of interested listeners, who gathered together for this purpose in the homes of members of varied reform proclivities.[28]

At about the time Warren became acquainted with Andrews, he also began relations with Charles Coffin Jewett, who had been appointed the Librarian of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, and who was looking for a satisfactory printing process to print the Institution's first centralized catalog of books. His search led him to Warren, and the two men worked together for some time before Jewett decided to employ Warren's stereotyping process. While this was going on, Warren was still interested in the mutual village in Ohio and in doubt as to whether he should return, and at the same time was speaking frequently around Boston, discussing with Andrews the possibility of another colony on Long Island, and making trips to Washington to confer with Jewett. It was indeed a busy time.

From the fall of 1850 into the spring of 1851, Warren described the technical progress of his process in his correspondence to Andrews, and his cordial relations with Jewett; the two apparently shared considerable mutual respect and affection. "Mr. Jewett is delighted with the very first results here," he wrote Andrews early in October, and subsequent cheerful dispatches from Boston or Washington culminated with the triumphant announcement in mid-March, 1851 that Jewett was "perfectly delighted" with their application of the process to his cataloguing

---

the letter Warren addressed to friends in the East from New Harmony on August 26, 1849, in *Boston Investigator,* September 25, 1849.

[27] In a letter to John Sullivan Dwight, Greene, writing in January, 1850, mentioned a petition to the Massachusetts General Court for permission to establish a mutual bank, which was signed by Warren, among others.

[28] Warren's lecture style differed little whether speaking before large or small groups. Primarily consisting of detailed answers to questions from the audience, it was of little effectiveness on the larger scale. A small manuscript notebook containing concisely-worded definitions to which he made recourse on the lecture platform is in the Warren MSS. in the Labadie Collection.

project, followed by the heartwarming news on April 1 that a committee set up by the Smithsonian had investigated his printing process "most severely," had reported "unqualifiedly in its favor," and "had advised purchase for the Institution." It was indeed a day of high joy for Warren.[28a]

An explanation of the strategy which resulted in the decision to form an individualist colony on Long Island was never made, although three important circumstances have significant bearing on the matter. Andrews' contacts in New York and his wide association with many varieties of radical thought in and around the city undoubtedly made possible a ready dissemination of information as well as details for the recruitment of persons interested in colonization. Secondly, it had long been a contention of Warren's that origins of a decentralist colony along his lines should always be made near a large city,[29] with the unabashed intention of using the older community as a prop until the economy of the new community was a functioning reality. Finally, Warren's acquaintance with prominent land reformers[30] in New York, as well as knowledge of their literature, had helped to reveal to him a usually ignored fact. The rush of the land-hungry to the new areas of Iowa and Minnesota now and then by-passed pockets of relatively inaccessible soil which the railroads subsequently opened up. In general there were few who were sufficiently impressed or possessed with sufficient powers of deduction to take advantage of opportunities of this kind, and Long Island was one of them, an incident which followed this expansion of transportation.

Opened up by the belated building of the Long Island Railroad, some half million acres of land became available for occupation and use in the 1840's, but a general movement upon it did not take place. The character of portions of it was distinctly inhibitory; thick growths of scrub oak and jack pine made the land costly to clear, and the sandy loam was considered unproductive unless treated with considerable applications of manure and other types of fertilizer.[31] On the other hand, there were those who presented factors in its favor from an agricultural point of view. Farm experts already settled on parts of the island declared that although these objections might be true, the land produced amply, and the proximity of the New York market made an investment in land here more desirable economically than in the newly-opened areas of the trans-Mississippi country. Few agreed with them, on any account, and as a result, an unopened country, relatively speaking, remained at the door of the nation's largest city. With such circumstances prevailing, the impulse behind the beginning of "Modern Times" becomes a little better understood.

[28a] Jewett was Librarian of the Smithsonian Institution from 1849 to 1854. Warren's process was employed to print its first centralized catalog of books, the *Catalog of the Library of Congress. Chapter 1. Ancient History Complete to January, 1854.* See Joseph Borome, *Charles Coffin Jewett* (Chicago, 1951); Warren to Andrews, October 8, October 12, October 20, 1850 (from Boston); March 12 (?), March 15, April 1, June 4, 1851 (from Washington), in Baskette Collection. Warren was paid $650 for the right to use his stereotypy.

[29] *Equitable Commerce,* 67.

[30] Warren was acquainted with the George Henry Evans associates through the pages of their periodical *Young America,* and especially with Lewis Masquerier, a former Owenite whom he admired and respected, but with whom he disagreed in the matter of locating authority. Masquerier later substantiated Warren's stand, declaring that land reform was an impossibility until "officialdom" was eliminated. Another of Warren's acquaintances was Joshua K. Ingalls, another land reformer of the same group, with whom he engaged in discussions on economics, especially the nature of interest. Ingalls also joined the fringes of the anarchist camp in the post-Civil War period. Warren to Maria and Thomas Varney, February 7, 1847, in *Practical Details,* 102-103; Lewis Masquerier, *Sociology: or, the Reconstruction of Society, Government and Property*, 73, 87-88; Joshua K. Ingalls, *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian in the Fields of Industrial and Social Reform,* 51.

By the end of 1850, Warren and Andrews had worked out their plans and strategy, and practical operations were just a step away. Warren himself was on the scene in January, 1851 with a handful of the first members, Andrews remaining in New York to complete arrangements with the owners of the land upon which the individualists were to found their town.[32] Warren had not overlooked Andrews' value as a propagandist in the cause; the latter's writings and lectures became a primary source of information to the outside as to the aims and accomplishments of the Long Island group.

"Modern Times" "commenced," according to Warren, on March 21, 1851. The site of the "rudimental town" was on a tract of 750 acres of land about four miles from the ocean on the south side of the island and about 40 miles[33] out from the city of New York. A factor of considerable influence in the choice of this particular site, according to Charles A. Codman, later to become the last survivor of the original community people, was the fact that the owners were willing to accept a very small cash down payment and a five year bond for the balance due. This extension of payment was a matter of great concern, in view of the lack of capital.[34]

---

[31] An excellent account of the circumstances resulting in the choice of Long Island as the place of location, by a contemporary and participant, is that of Thomas L. Nichols, *Forty Years of American Life,* II, 36. Nichols and his talented wife took part in several reforms in the first half of the nineteenth century, finally becoming converts to Roman Catholicism and emigrating to England, where the above work was published. For their activities see Bertha-Monica Stearns, "Two Forgotten New England Reformers," in *New England Quarterly,* VI (March, 1933), 59-84.

[32] Warren to Andrews, January 5, 1851, Warren MSS., Workingmen's Institute Library. See also the article by Max Nettlau, "Anarchism in England Fifty Years Ago," in *Liberty,* XV (February, 1906), 46, which quotes from a letter to the London *Leader,* September 6, 1851, giving details of a lecture by Andrews before the Fourierist North American Phalanx in New Jersey in February of that year, stating that the land on Long Island had at that time been secured and that the community was about to start. Letter signed "M" and written March 4, 1851.

[33] Warren, *Practical Details,* preface, vi. This preface was written by Andrews, and appeared in both the 1852 and 1854 editions without changes. It does not appear that Warren was on the scene when the "beginning" occurred, since he was in Washington working with Jewett at the Smithsonian Institution, and wrote letters to Andrews dated March 15 and April 1 from Washington (in Baskette Collection). In the first of these, Warren wrote, "I have finally come to the conclusion that I could not in any way

About 90 acres of this area was set aside for the town itself, which was laid out in 49 blocks. The town consisted of seven streets running north and south and seven avenues running east and west, with right angle intersections. The blocks were divided into four lots each, with a frontage of 200 feet, and each block had an alley running only in the north-south direction. In the center of each of these alleys was a well. The alleys were common property in the beginning, and this matter rose to plague the residents of a somewhat later time, since there was no ostensible manner of obtaining title to this land. Through involved legal proceedings, however, the alleys were attached to the lots and no longer exist.[35]

As had before been arranged at 'Utopia," a contract was secured

---

accomplish as much in perhaps years as I could in weeks or months with you, and therefore have determined to come immediately to N.Y., i.e., Modern Times, build me a domicil, and then extend outwards according to my means for a few weeks perhaps months before I go West, making M.T. the head quarters for the Typography." It would seem that at this point Warren had ideas of returning to the Ohio community to live, using "Modern Times" as a kind of eastern base for business purposes. In his letter of April 1, he told Andrews he was using the money he was getting from the Smithsonian Institution for his stereotypy to buy the remaining unsold lots at "Utopia," and it is not until April 20, 1851 that a letter to Andrews definitely places Warren at Modern Times. At the present time "Modern Times," or Brentwood, as the community has been known for over 85 years, is 26.2 miles from the city line of New York and 42.8 miles from New York's Pennsylvania Station in railway mileage.

[34] One of the most curious and valuable of the previously unused documents relating to the history of the Warrenite community on Long Island is Charles A. Codman, "History of the City of Modern Times," an unpublished manuscript of 23 large sheets, undated and unpaginated, closely handwritten in pencil. Two typewritten copies and the crumbling original are in the collection of "Modern Times" material in the Suffolk County Historical Society building in Riverhead, L.I. The authenticity of this document has been attested to by Dr. William H. Ross of Brentwood, a practicing physician in the community for well over half a century and a resident since 1890. Dr. Ross became acquainted with Codman at this time, and their friendship continued until the latter's death in 1911. As Codman's literary executor, Dr. Ross is responsible for the deposition of this manuscript and others relating to the community at Riverhead. It is the opinion of Dr. Ross that the Codman account was written sometime during the mid-1880's, as it was already in existence when he first came to Brentwood.

[35] The alleys were supposed to have been twelve feet wide but were probably somewhat larger, since the "acre" lots as disposed to prospective settlers were reduced to 200 foot frontages, leaving a noticeable discrepancy. A map of "Modern Times" dated January 22, 1859 is located in Riverhead, but it is a surveyor's map, showing only the town blocks and not the various properties.

providing that all land would be sold to individual settlers at cost, the acre lot selling for approximately $20. Three acres was the maximum holding which any person might purchase in the town.[36] Warren had in mind an "equitable village" of 1000[37] persons possessing a wide variety of occupations, not a purely agricultural community. For this reason, ownership in the town itself was restricted, although those interested in farming had access to the remaining land on the periphery of the town, which sold for the same price.

"Modern Times" was a hand-picked congregation at the beginning. A policy of expediency was adopted which allowed the first ten purchasers of land to screen later buyers, who had to be acceptable to one of these ten before being admitted to the group. Similar to the policy in effect at "Utopia," both Warren and Andrews admitted that this and other actions were violations of the principles which they advocated, but justified this as a protection against the acquisition of vital areas by persons who might be either indifferent or hostile to the cost economy experiment.[38] This policy was gradually abandoned, as friends rather than enemies were to furnish the distressing occasions in later years and eventually contribute to the abandonment of most of the desired goals. Even in the early months, however, it was stressed that individual responsibility was the foundation upon which they were building, and that it was up to each person to satsify himself as to what type of organization he sought to create. At no time were potential settlers or interested persons discouraged from learning what was being attempted "on the grounds"; Andrews said:[39]

> . . . we recommend all those who are desirous of removal to an equitable village, first to visit it, and remain long enough . . . to form the personal acquaintance of those who are already there, to penetrate thoroughly their designs, the spirit by which they are imbued, and the extent of their moral and material means of accomplishing what they propose.

The earliest residents engaged in a variety of endeavors during the first year. Small houses, generally log cabins, began to be erected, with the usual separation of money and labor costs. Daniel D. Thompkins Moore, founder and editor of *The Rural New Yorker,* described the soil of Brentwood, the later name of the townsite and the extended community which exists there today,[40] as "a fine genial brown loam," very similar to the market garden lands of England, and later experience was to prove its productivity. In the beginning, appearances were far less promising. Outside help was utilized to aid in clearing and plowing land intended for agriculture, which proved somewhat costly in most cases. Removal of scrub growth and roots generally cost $30 an acre. Most of the woody materials, amounting to from twenty to thirty cords per acre, were burned and re-applied to the soil, a type of dressing which was highly esteemed.[41] Agricultural land further required some $40 worth of fertilizer per acre, land being thus prepared yielding surprising crops of several varieties of garden truck, which was later marketed in the city. This was facilitated by the fact that Thompson's Station, the stop on the railroad, was a short distance north of the village.[42]

---

[36] *Practical Details,* preface, vi-vii. This is a meticulous account of the land policy at "Modern Times," which can be supplemented by that of Henry Edger, whose letter to the London *Leader,* March 27, 1852, is reprinted in Richmond L. Hawkins, *Positivism in the United States (1853-1861),* 115. This letter, written from Williamsburg, New York, November 2, 1851, corroborates much of the material written by Andrews, and appears to be for the most part a re-wording of the first work cited above. In view of the fact that Edger became a convert to "Modern Times" through Andrews' influence, it is highly probable that it was as a result of the latter's published works, primarily. Nettlau, who first used this letter in 1906, gives the date as November 21, 1851.

[37] *Periodical Letter,* I, 98-99.

[38] *Practical Details,* preface, vii; *Periodical Letter,* I, 71.

[39] *Practical Details,* preface, above.

Warren himself engaged in the building activities, erecting a house at a total money cost of $120, which he later sold for the same sum.[43] Building costs were appreciably lowered by another of his inventions, a method of making bricks from the gravel and lime of the area and hardening these by drying in the sun. By the end of the first year he had also completed a combination workshop and apprentice school which was known as the "college," a brick structure thirty-two feet square, two stories high. The lower floor was devoted to a time store and shops, the upper and the attic were devoted to ordinary dwelling space.

By the middle of 1853, "Modern Times" had become physically attractive. Most of the land on the town site had been cleared and the original log cabins replaced by well-constructed cottages. The streets were beginning to be lined with shade and fruit trees, and the discovery of soft water of fine quality at depths of from thirty to forty feet proved to be another distinct advantage.[44] Building on the labor exchange principle was a pursuit of nearly all the men. Some sixty persons now occupied the premises, a meager number still, when compared with Warren's expectations, yet this represented an increase almost triple that of ten months previous. The townsmen were quite frank in admitting that they had by no means perfected their economic institution. Some residents practiced trades and supplied services which were in little demand, with the result that they were forced to work for wages in New York. The group failed as well in their immediate achievement of self-reliance for all material needs, some of which were of necessity procured in the city.[45] In spite of adversities, faith in the soundness of their economic and social conceptions abounded. Confident that numbers sufficient to provide demand for the labor of all would arrive soon, preparations for the construction of a labor exchange were arranged much similar to that which had existed as an accompaniment to the first Cincinnati time store. Still more important was the general morale prevailing; a visitor and subsequent member reported, "the movement . . . does inspire its votaries here . . . with a confidence and zeal that cannot be surpassed."[46]

---

[40] A recent work of value to students of "Modern Times" is Verne Dyson, *A Century of Brentwood.* Although the chapters devoted to the radical colony and its personalities lack organization and integration, much material of genealogical and antiquarian interest is available for the first time in this volume. Since this study is concerned primarily with "Modern Times" and its relation to Josiah Warren, it varies in interpretation with the above work, which is written from the point of departure of local history.

[41] *Periodical Letter,* I, 34-35. Some discrepancy exists in accounts as to the actual price paid for land at "Modern Times." In this issue of the *Periodical Letter,* written in August, 1854, Warren said that the cost came to approximately $22, after all charges had been added. For additional material on the soil and growing conditions of the area consult William H. Ross, "A Study of the Climate of Long Island," in *Brooklyn Medical Journal,* March, 1904, reprinted as a 14 page pamphlet. For Moore see editorial " 'The Rural New-Yorker'—1850-1950," in *The Rural New-Yorker,* C (January 7, 1950), 64.

[42] For the origins of Thompson's Station, see Dyson, *Century of Brentwood,* 11-12.

[43] Warren to Andrews, April 26, 1851, Warren MSS., Workingmen's Institute; Edger to London *Leader,* November 2, 1851, in Hawkins, *Positivism,* 115.

While the practical operations were being conducted at "Modern Times," the propaganda of Warrenite anarchist economic and social doctrines, directed by Andrews in New York, flared brilliantly, with repercussions from several directions. At about the time that preparations were being made to move out to the site selected for the demonstration of Individual Sovereignty, Andrews formed an association with the Fowlers and Wells Company, a firm of book publishers specializing in the writings of several fragments of the radical movement of the time. Although their particular interest lay in phrenology and spiritualism,[47] The Fowler brothers undertook the dissemination of a series of modest volumes which brought the core of native American anarchist thought before a sizeable cross-section of the nation's reading public.

In 1851, Andrews' *Science of Society*[48] series first appeared. The next year a second edition of this was accompanied by a third edition of Warren's *Equitable Commerce,* which Andrews admitted as the source of his ideas. As a companion of the theoretical works, Fowlers brought out Warren's early experiences in a volume titled *Practical Details in Equitable Commerce,* two editions being printed from the same plates in 1852 and 1854.

---

[44] Edger to London *Leader,* June 8, 1853, in Hawkins, *Positivism* 117; Nichols, *Forty Years,* II, 41. The soil and climate of the area have proved especially congenial to growth of trees. Thirty different varieties of evergreens alone exist in Brentwood today.

[45] Noyes, *American Socialisms,* quotes the following charming aside as recorded by A. J. MacDonald in a conversation with a resident in the latter part of 1853: ". . . many of our members are forced to go out into the world to earn what people call money. . . . ," 100. The dependence was lessened for a time, but returned with greater urgency during the Civil War.

[46] Edger to London *Leader,* June 8, 1853, in Hawkins, *Positivism,* above.

[47] John K. Winkler and Walter Bromberg, *Mind Explorers* (New York, 1939), 33-34.

[48] It is considered today that Andrews' work had influence among anarchists in Germany and Spain as well as America. A German translation, *Die Wissenschaft von der Gesellschaft,* by Mathilde Kriege and Wilhelm Russbüldt, appeared in Berlin in 1904. There are also evidences of Andrews'

The reprinting of *Equitable Commerce* was the signal for the reopening of the controversy with the highly articulate group of Fourierites now centered in New York around Horace Greeley, Charles Dana and the *New York Tribune.* This was the last important stand of Associationist socialism both in theory and practice, the North American Phalanx in nearby New Jersey being their last community in sound condition. From this time on the "Modern Times" colony was to get little support and less peace from the metropolitan area, primarily as a result of the searchlight which was to be turned upon it by the *Tribune.* A disparaging three and a half column review of *Equitable Commerce,* generally attributed to George Ripley, erstwhile president of the Brook Farm Association, broke out in the pages of the *Tribune* in the summer of 1852. Andrews attempted to soften its impact with a two column letter to the editor in rebuttal,[49] but Warren personally was apathetic; in a letter to Andrews in July of the same year, he said:[50]

> You know I have long ago ceased to hope for anything from Editors or any others who have any particular position or isms to sustain. . . . The great point is to inform the public what we really mean before leaders get a chance to misrepresent our views and movements.

In actuality criticism by exponents of Fourierism was a minor item as an element of detraction. "Modern Times," like Brook Farm a few years earlier, was beginning to attract visitors possessed with an in-

---

impact on the Spaniard Francisco Pi y Margall. Pi y Margall, although not an anarchist, has had high repute among Spanish anarchists, and his book *La Reacción y la Revolucion* (Madrid, 1854), drawn partially from *The Science of Society,* was reprinted in the anarchist lists of La Revista Blanca and circulated all over Spain. See Gerald Brenan, *The Spanish Labyrinth: An Account of the Social and Political Background of the Civil War* (New York, 1943), 358.

[49] The entire controversy is reprinted in Andrews, *Science of Society,* 1888 edition, 153-165. Ripley was in full accord with Warren's Sovereignty of the Individual concept, although claiming that Channing, Henry James and Theodore Parker originally propounded it. Even if Greeley was considered an opponent of the community, Codman declared that he purchased lots there, but did not mention the date. See article "Red Owl Cottage Hermit," in *Brooklyn Times,* July 29, 1893.

[50] *Periodical Letter,* I, 86. Warren apparently considered Horace Greeley primarily responsible for the attack. In a letter to Stephen Pearl Andrews, Warren commented, "It is worthy of note that the only one who has denied the soundness of Cost as the limit of Price is the Editor of the most prominent reform paper in America. What is this prominence for?" Warren to Andrews, July 1, 1852, Baskette Collection.

satiable curiosity as to the social life of the new model town.[51] The Warrenite conception of individuality had no room for restrictions upon the religious or moral beliefs and practices of the residents any more than upon any other aspects of their existence. Compliance with religious and marital customs and regulations was a voluntary matter. The lack of coercion and the fastening of responsibility for all behavior upon the individual created an area of free movement invigorating to the residents and a source of consternation to those outside possessing more strait-laced convictions. Complete respect for individual peculiarities also served to attract eccentrics or rebels at convention, and in the case of enlightened ladies in the habit of wearing bloomers or men's clothing, created a sensational focus for scandal for outsiders.[52] "Modern Times" as Warren conceived it did not abolish restraints which the outside considered essential to social well-being; it merely failed to recognize that an element of restriction was necessary in an environment where it was assumed that freedom of action should have no limitation beyond the refraining from infringement upon rights of others to do the same. The assumption of responsibility, the avoidance of the inflicting of the consequences of one's acts upon others, was felt sufficient as a principle of social behavior.

It is not surprising, then, to observe the attack upon "Modern Times" as a center of sexual irregularity,[53] among other things. Although unfounded, such charges did have validity when reviewed as a reflection of the moral concepts of a period dominated by lip service to puritanical codes of sexual deportment.[54] The whispering campaign of critical observers and gossips, aided by a barrage of innuendo furnished by the New York newspapers, finally forced the residents into an act of self-defense. In September, 1852, Warren addressed a circular to the "general public" which all the "adult citizens" in the colony signed. In it he developed the case for the individualists, hoping to allay the suspicions of the righteous and at the same time demonstrate to potential friends the real nature of the activities on Long Island and deflate the collection of disturbing rumors in existence.

Concerned over the tendency of visitors and others to look upon the assemblage as a secret cult due to their reticence and aversion toward publicity, Warren hastened to inform all that no society or organization existed, nor did the residents have a rigid corporate structure which arbitrarily restricted membership. Re-affirming the belief in the soundness of the policy of absolute individual responsibility for opinions and conduct, as well as the economic experiments being made, he appealed to outsiders to base their judgments upon accurate, reliable reports and not hearsay, in which category he placed most of the press notices. In like manner he deprecated the destructive rumors "by those whose object it is to ride high upon any hobby, even at the expense of other people," seeking to "ruin what they cannot rule." Suggesting the reading of recently published books explaining the philosophy of individual sovereignty rather than relying on ignorance and prejudice, he protested in the name of "The City of Modern Times": "We cannot consent to have our time consumed . . . and our peace continually disturbed in refuting ignorant, vile, and ridiculous fabrications."[55]

---

[51] See for instance the description in Octavius B. Frothingham, *George Ripley* (Boston, 1882), 125-130, for interesting parallels.

[52] Nichols, *Forty Years,* II, 41-42.

[53] Modern treatments stress this aspect; see for example Grace Adams and Edward Hutter, *The Mad Forties.*

[54] Fish, *Rise of the Common Man,* 152-154.

The continued association of Warren's name with imagined and real social irregularities provoked the publication of *Positions Defined* in August of the following year. Warren denied that the "Equity Movement" was necessarily characterized by unusual freedom in marriage relations, insisting that individual sovereignty was as valid with respect to retaining the conventional association as it was for advocating radical departures. Angered at being erroneously quoted, Warren in this leaflet publicly disavowed his connection with any speaker or paper purporting to represent him unless sanction with specifically given.

All efforts to continue developing in the pleasant obscurity which attended the sister settlement in Ohio went to naught, nevertheless, as the tendency for "Modern Times" to act as a magnet for unpopular and exotic beliefs continued to strengthen. Particularly damaging from the point of view of adverse public opinion was the temporary concentration there of the semi-mystical creed of "spiritual affinity," under the leadership of Dr. Thomas L. Nichols.[56] Combining portions of spiritualism, socialism, and what was later to be known as "women's rights," Nichols' doctrine had by this time acquired the label "Free Love" among most of those outside who were acquainted with it. The advocacy of a general loosening of marriage ties and a greater freedom for women in all matters relating to the institution, despite its idealistic foundation, provoked a violent reaction in the newspapers and from clergymen.

Nichols' appearance at "Modern Times" in 1853 had been preceded by the publication there a year before of a modest journal titled *The Art of Living,* which presented the case of the vanguard in the struggle for a greater degree of female social and economic equality.[57] Spiritual Affinity aroused little concern among the practical people of "Modern Times," many of whom had arrived at similar ideas and were already

---

[55] *Practical Details,* preface, viii.

[56] Nichols was a Fourierite socialist, a fact which he thought had to be qualified by informing the public that he was also attached to the extremely individualistic convictions which helped comprise spiritualism. Stearns, "Two Forgotten Reformers," 77; Noyes, *American Socialism,* 93.

[57] See especially Nichols' article "The Future of Women," in *The Art of Living,* II (July, 1852), 50. Nichols, a trained physician, was also interested in water cure therapy.

living them without a propaganda of literature, but Nichols and his close associates had pronounced influence in the city. What hope existed that the potential trouble would quietly subside evaporated when Andrews became involved in a three-cornered controversy with Horace Greeley and Henry James, dealing with aspects of love, marriage and divorce which were considered extremely delicate by segments of majority public opinion. Thereafter for the duration of its existence and well into the period when "Modern Times" had become Brentwood, the place became synonymous with scandalous behavior as well as a suspected hotbed of licentiousness, a state of mind which Andrews' lengthy communications in the *Tribune* tended to make permanent.[58]

The removal of Nichols to Cincinnati a year later had little effect in reducing apprehension. A potential colonist, writing from Connecticut, queried as to the system prevailing at "Modern Times":[59]

> Is it intended that families live together similarly as in the monogamic system or in large Houses contemplated by Communists or in isolation and alone . . . by himself or herself. . . . Having of late been brought in contact with the writings of Mr. and Mrs. Nichols through their Journal . . . and in which I find many things to approve and not any really to condemn, although I may not as yet be able to sanction them and from his interest in the village presume that the principles there practiced or intended to be practiced there to be in unison with his.

Thus there existed considerable confusion and misunderstanding concerning the Warrenite town. Not only was there a belief that social chaos reigned, but among its friends there was no general agreement as to its essential nature, with estimates ranging all the way from community of property to a mere collection of hermits and recluses. Not many more than the fifty or so families[60]actually residing there seemed to be aware of the voluntary coöperative community originally contemplated. Warren, no radical on the marriage question, deplored Nichols and the mixing of the labor and marriage reforms. He later blamed the whole matter as the cause of most of the trouble experienced and the principal reason why "Modern Times" failed to continue growing after the first three years.[61] The "ogre," as he labeled the "free love" movement, confronted nearly every social reform movement from Robert Owen's time onward, in one form or another, threatening a complete split in the intellectual anarchist camp twenty years after "Modern Times." The defection of Nichols[62] and the withdrawal of Andrews from the ranks of the active propagandists neither brought the season of problems to an end nor did it result in a decrease in the volume of intellectual sorties on the Long Island social laboratory.

---

[58] The entire body of correspondence of the three participants, including dispatches which Andrews claimed were suppressed by the *Tribune,* was gathered and published posthumously in one volume under the title *Love, Marriage and Divorce, and the Sovereignty of the Individual. A Discussion Between Henry James, Horace Greeley and Stephen Pearl Andrews,* in 1889.

[59] DeWitt Upson to Josiah Warren, April 4, 1854, Warren MSS., Labadie Collection.

[60] *Periodical Letter,* I, 69.

[61] See note 21, above. Warren's brief account titled "A Few Words to the Pioneers" involved him in an acrimonious argument with some of the more aggressive spirits of the Victoria Woodhull coterie, who accused him of supporting their enemies when it was reprinted at the height of the first wave of Comstock Law prosecutions in 1871.

Notable among these was the bitter attack by Adin Ballou, the New Testament fundamentalist patriarch of Hopedale Community in Massachusetts. Hopedale, entering a period of declining fortunes which was to end in bankruptcy in February, 1856,[63] combined a paternalistic religious atmosphere dominated by Ballou with an economy embodying some aspects of socialism but in actuality controlled by a minority group of stockholders, into whose hands the colony eventually fell. Ballou's attention first became directed toward "Modern Times" following the desertion of several of his own group to the Warrenite settlement in 1853, as a result of the influence of the doctrines of Nichols.[64] Ballou's *Practical Christian Socialism,* published the next year, incorporated a severe castigation of Warren and the entire philosophy of individual sovereignty.[65] Recognizing its position apart from the teachings of Owen, Fourier and John Humphrey Noyes, the Hopedale sage indicted it as "an irreligious, immoral and licentious doctrine," deploring its non-committal stand on religion and its virtual rejection of belief in God by virtue of its uncompromising stand in placing the individual person at the apex of their system.

Scandalized by the report that marriage as an institution was subject to constant criticism and that residents of "Modern Times" entered the married state with neither the legal nor ecclesiastical sanctions normally obtained, Ballou launched an attack on such behavior as "Free Love promiscuity," repeating for the most part the familiar misconceptions which the uninformed everywhere were propagating.[66] Warren took little notice of Ballou's criticisms of either the social or economic basis of "Modern Times," although a *Tribune* article by the former stung him into an objection to the stress upon religious dogmatism and Christianity. Ballou intensely contested the Warren insistence upon the right to the full product of labor by the producer, but his alternative Warren found eminently unsatisfactory:[67]

---

[62] Warren's wife, also a spiritualist, remained in contact with Nichols while at home in New Harmony after the latter had gone to Cincinnati in 1855, subscribing to the new organ of the protagonists of spiritualism, women's rights and health experimentation, *Nichols' Monthly.* Caroline Cutter Warren to Josiah Warren, June 27, August 26, 1855, Warren MSS., Labadie Collection.

[63] William S. Heywood, ed., *Autobiography of Adin Ballou,* 401.

[64] Ballou, *History of Hopedale Community,* 246.

[65] Ballou, *Practical Christian Socialism,* 623.

[66] The statement was an obvious contradiction in terms to the adherents of spiritual affinity, yet assumed to be synonymous by Ballou and most others at the time, one of the principal reasons for Warren's objection to the vigor of the campaign being carried on by Nichols. Ballou, *Practical Christian Socialism,* 624. The late Ammon Hennacy twitted "free love" smears by inquiring of the makers of such charges if they preferred "bought love."

> . . . I decline any controversy with a man who is satisfied with the word "reasonable" as a standard of measurement in a disputed subject, as I would object to purchasing cloth of a merchant who used a gum elastic yard stick.

If Warren objected to the conversion of what primarily had been intended as an experiment in cost economy into an experimental station for sexual autonomy, he resented as markedly the undermining of the colony itself by Henry Edger, an early enthusiast and member. An Englishman by birth, Edger came to the United States[68] in 1851 with the intention of joining Étienne Cabet's well-known colony of Icaria, in Illinois.[69] An early reading of Stephen Pearl Andrews' *Science of Society* resulted in the transfer of his attachment to the individualist school. Andrews he continued to regard the progenitor of the movement, although it is improbable that the latter spent more than brief moments there after the community became established. Edger's decision to become a member of the group was not made until the summer of 1853. Abandoning the profession of law, having been a barrister in London, he moved to "Modern Times"[70] and made a living as a nurseryman for the duration of his stay of over twenty-five years. Affection for equitist principles had a brief sway, his energies the following year being taken up in the propagation of the philosophy of Auguste Comte, with whom he soon established a correspondence.[71] His life thereafter became a dedication to Comtean Positivism, of which he was the first exponent in the United States.

The religious aspect of Positivism, the real concern of Comte as far as relations with Edger and "Modern Times" were concerned, appeared to other inhabitants as hardly more than a blunt reaction erected on a foundation of authoritarianism. As the Religion of Humanity, its princi-

---

67. *Periodical Letter,* I, 113.
68. Edger was born January 22, 1820, in Chelwood Gate parish of Fletching, Sussex, England. He filed a declaration of intention of American citizenship on April 23, 1851, and became naturalized November 18, 1861. He died at Versailles, France, April 18, 1888. Henry Edger, *Auguste Comte and the Middle Ages,* 115; Jorge Lagarrigue, ed., *Lettres d'Auguste Comte, fondateur de la religion universelle et premier grandeprêtre de l'humanité à Henry Edger et à John Metcalfe . . .,* vi.
69. Edger to London *Leader,* July 19, 1851, cited in Nettlau, "Anarchism," 46.
70. In March, 1854, Edger wrote a letter to the London *Leader* which was published on July 22, 1854, indicating for the first time that he was now a permanent resident of the colony.
71. Edger wrote sixteen letters to Comte between 1854 and 1857 which contain much information about "Modern Times."

pal objective appeared to be to them a frontal attack on individualism, attempting to substitute for the doctrine of self-interest an altruistic love of humanity in the mass. Its curious mixture of virgin and ancestor worship and obsession with authoritarian solutions had practically no appeal during the period it was propagated most vigorously in "Modern Times," nor did its proposed restoration of a social matriarchy and introduction of a paternalistic economic system which faintly reflected attitudes which gained articulation later in the century in the celebrated "Gospel of Wealth."[72] To anarchists of a later generation who were among the first to examine the correspondence of Comte to Edger, much of the contents seemed hardly credible, especially the plan to convert "Modern Times" into a Positivist town and Long Island into a separate state in the union.[73]

In the hopes of conditioning the minds of the residents for the acceptance of the religious and economic centralized hierarchy which constituted the Comtean social system, Edger began a vigorous attack upon the very basis of the town, and fought its individualist and decentralist aspects. Professing to abhor the individual sovereignty doctrine now, he did not hesitate to admit that he planned to take advantage of the protection it offered; ". . . this little village where I live has, notwithstanding its pre-eminent anarchy, a powerful attraction for me. Here I meet at least with the widest tolerance."[74] Now began his vigorous propaganda campaign aimed at its overthrow, so that completely contradictory tenets might thus be substituted.

The establishment of a small Positivist chapel and the printing and circulating, in the fall of 1855, of a tract entitled *Modern Times, The Labor Question and the Family,* placed the Positivist stand squarely before the inhabitants. The ten principles formulated by Edger included the substitution of "duties" for "rights," unqualified adherence to monogamic marriage, the development of a positivist priesthood, and insistence on the necessity of class differences,[75] none of which found much acceptance among the original inhabitants. Particular resistance was met from the women, Edger observed; adherence to the particularly individualistic beliefs of spiritualism and women's rights partially accounted for this attitude.[76]

---

[72] Auguste Comte, *Appel aux Conservateurs* (Paris, 1855), 74-80; Georges Dumas, "Auguste Comte et les Jesuites," in *Revue de Paris,* V (October, 1898), 557-568; John K. Ingram, *Passages from the Letters of Auguste Comte,* 145; Hawkins, *Positivism,* 160, 181. A valuable summary of positivism is that of Alexander Goldenweiser in the article "Social Evolution," in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* V, 657.

[73] Comte to Edger, July 21, 1855, November 20, 1856, in *Letters,* 23, 51; Nettlau, "Anarchism," 48.

[74] Edger to Comte, July 21, 1854, in Hawkins, *Positivism,* 133.

[75] Hawkins, *Positivism,* 165.

[76] Edger to Comte, July 21, November 3, 1854; February 5, 1855, in Hawkins, *Positivism,* 134, 143, 147.

Edger's disparagement of the labor exchange had some effect, but sizeable portions of the town's economy functioned through the use of labor notes long after his effort to paralyze it had dissipated itself. One of Edger's fond hopes was the expectation of aid in the form of philanthropy, confident that such help would be forthcoming from some rich man attracted by the opportunity of status to be realized in the coming community.[77] But no man of wealth, intrigued by the possibility of becoming a member of the apex of Comte's future patriciate, or "Industrial Chivalry," as it was termed, ever put in the anticipated appearance.

Generally speaking, Edger made practically no headway in the dissemination of Positivism at "Modern Times." In a letter to Comte written in the early part of 1857 he reported disconsolately:[78]

> . . . To confess the truth it is the small sympathy I can find among the members of our own school . . . that is my principal discouragement. What is all our philosophy, all our sociology, all our doctrine from beginning to end, in the absence of an actually constituted church and priesthood?

To this evidence of pessimism, including the admission of lack of believers, Comte had repeatedly rejoined with cautions against presumptions in such unusual circumstances:[79]

> You attach too much importance to your abnormal surroundings at Modern Times. Even in the best environment, positivism can hope to convert only one one-thousandth of the present generation, . . . Conversions will be rare in your anarchical village. You should devote your attention above all to conservatives, who are . . . the most likely converts to positivism.

To Comte, Warren's philosophy of mutual coöperation on a basis of individual responsibility was primitive and backward, advising that it was best ignored:[80]

> You must not waste your time in publishing refutations of anarchical sophisms. Spend it rather in spreading positivisms by means of conversation.

Despite Warren's anxiety, "Modern Times" remained adamant to Edger's earnest proselytizing. The latter's personal journal listed the membership of the Positivist Society of Modern Times in 1859 at only six beyond the members of his own family, and only four of these actually resided on Long Island.[81] His failure as a missionary did not affect his reputation for he remained an esteemed citizen of the community for some time, during which he occasionally contributed articles on Comtean philosophy to liberal journals at irregular occasions. In one sense it might be held that Edger finally won out over "Modern Times" but not in the manner in which he expected. When the people elected to change the name of the community, during the Civil War, to Brentwood, they honored this first disciple of Auguste Comte, and his wife, both former residents of Brentwood, England.[82]

---

[77] Edger to Comte, March 3, 1856, in Hawkins, *Positivism,* 170-171.

[78] Edger to Comte, March 8, 1857, in Hawkins, *Positivism,* 188.

[79] Lagarrigue, ed., *Lettres,* 10; Ingram, *Passages,* 147-148; Hawkins, *Positivism,* 145. Warren commented on Comte's views in the September, 1857 *Periodical Letter.*

[80] Lagarrigue, ed., *Lettres,* 30-31; Ingram, *Passages,* above; Hawkins, *Positivism,* 167.

"Modern Times" in 1854 was a gathering of 37 families, with a slow, gradual growth in numbers constantly being expected. Most of the productive activities centered around agricultural projects of one kind or another. A fruit tree nursery of considerable excellence was functioning, with another "in contemplation."[83] Truck gardening, primarily vegetables for the New York market, was the principal source of outside income, still of vital importance as the group had not grown large enough to provide for an economy entirely divorced from the money economy of the outside. One of the newer developments by the late summer of this year was a type of community dining hall, a prototype of the modern cafeteria, which was managed by Clark Orvis, who later became important in perfecting the velocipede. This new endeavor, known as the "Dining Saloon," afforded different opportunities than had usually been the lot in community projects of this sort. The individualization of the menu, providing some outlet for the expression of individual tastes, was looked upon by members of previous community life[84] as a striking innovation, where they had been restricted to a common fare noted for its monotony, regardless of the intent in furthering the democratization of the group.

In this same year Warren began publication of his famous *Periodical Letter,* a monthly journal[85] which explained the philosophy and activities of "Modern Times." Though its circulation was small, it had surprising distribution, with subscribers throughout the country, as well as England and Ireland. For the next four years it served not only to present the Long Island social experiment to interested liberals and radicals but to provide Warren with a sounding-board for the expression of his views on a wide variety of current topics and events of both national and international concern. The diplomatic incidents with Denmark and England, the Know Nothings, constitutional interpretation, slavery, the bloodshed in Kansas, Fremont as a presidential candidate, all found interpretations from the incipient anarchist viewpoint.[86]

---

[81] Hawkins, *Positivism,* 198.

[82] Brentwood records indicate that the name was officially adopted September 7, 1864, although it was nearly a decade before it became generally used. Edger remained for some time, writing for *The Index* and for Benjamin R. Tucker's *Radical Review.* See for instance his articles "Ritualism," in *The Index,* III, 194-195; "The Need of a Priesthood," in *The Index,* IV, 347-348. On the naming of Brentwood, see Codman, "Modern Times."

[83] *Periodical Letter,* I, 35.

[84] The tenacity of the background of the coöperative boardinghouses of the Rappites and New Harmony under Robert Owen is seen here. Warren was convinced that such activities, as well as dairies, laundries, and schools run on similar plans would find eventual preference among those who appreciated lowered costs and elimination of labor. *Equitable Commerce,* 39-40. A brief description of the boarding houses at New Harmony in the spring of 1826 is in Nicholson, *The Hoosiers,* 113. For Orvis see also the report from Brentwood by Minnie Morse, niece of the inventor of the telegraph, in *New York Herald,* July 17, 1904.

[85] For full title see Introduction, note 31.

Warren, granting the moral issue involved in the slavery question, continued the non-committal stand which had been taken for decades by economic radicals, and which had been thoroughly expressed by George Henry Evans in an exchange with Gerrit Smith some time before. To men like Warren and Evans, chattel slavery was merely one side of a brutal situation, and although sympathetic with its opponents, refused to take part in the struggle unless it was extended to a wholesale attack on what they termed "wage slavery" in the states where Negro slavery no longer existed. Freedom was an abstract state which had little appeal if it merely meant grave economic distress where employers no longer cared for or needed the services of "free" labor.[87]

With reference to the looming war, Warren believed that conflict on such a scale was an inherent part of the underlying conditions attending the original "association" of the states, merely awaiting the proper occasion when an issue of sufficient gravity and concern would result in a rebellion of the minority, upon pressure from the majority.[88] Slavery might be the immediate issue, he argued, but the possibilities of others in the future were guaranteed by the preservation of the structure of the political system.[89] He refused to take sides in the controversy, although he accused the South of inconsistency in the matter of threatened secession. If they asserted their right to secede as a matter of principle, then it followed that the slaves also had a right to "secede" from their owners, since both associations, the Union and the institution of slavery, were artificial arrangements now fastened together by the expedients of statute law.[90] However, if war was to be fought to preserve the political organization, he could see in this action only a sacrifice of the people to their own creature, the organization. For, as Warren wrote, "There has always been a perpetual contest between man and man made institutions; and although their struggles have cost the world more than all other causes put together, experience and learning seem to teach nothing to any purpose. Institutionalism is still sacred in the eyes of most people as Juggernaut in the eyes of its blind devotees. . . . So our civilization still continues in the midst of murder and confusion to invent and concoct institutions as substitutes for justice." (*Periodical Letter,* II, pp. 53-54).

---

[86] *Periodical Letter,* I, 126-127; II, 38-39, 49; I, 2nd. series, 113.

[87] Evans stated the case rather simply in an open letter to Smith in the *Working Man's Advocate* of July 6, 1844; "I was formerly, like yourself, sir, a very warm advocate of the abolition of slavery. This was before I saw that there was white slavery. Since I saw this, I have materially changed my views as to the manner of abolishing negro slavery. I see now clearly, I think, that to give the landless black the privilege of changing masters now possessed by the landless white would hardly be a benefit to him in exchange for his surety of support in sickness and old age, although he is in a favorable climate. If the southern form of slavery existed at the north, I should say the black would be a great loser in such a change." Commons, *Documentary History,* VII, 356. The exchange of views between Evans and Smith is reprinted from the *Working Man's Advocate,* July 6, July 27, and August 17, 1844, in Commons, *Documentary History,* VII, 352-364.

[88] "The articles of association being put down in words are subject to different interpretations and here is collision—then comes division into majority and minority—the majority prevail—the minority rebel—and here is war and weakness! This exactly the origin of the present political confusion of the dis-United States of America: in the meantime the objects professedly aimed at by our political organization as a nation are entirely repudiated . . ." *Periodical Letter,* I, 2nd. series, 102. Warren wrote this comment in December, 1857, while discussing the Kansas controversy.

Thus until the eve of the war Warren continued to use the pages of the *Periodical Letter* to expound the anti-statist viewpoint, attacking political organization and the attendant evils which he considered the results of the conflicts produced by the contest for control of its destinies. In espousing the unpopular doctrines of decentralist voluntary coöperation and disinterestedness toward nationalism, the *Periodical Letter* preceded the twentieth century publications of the anarchist press which have persisted in presenting the same outlook with reference to modern problems, although the latter have operated in the face of suppression and persecution which Warren never experienced.

Although dismayed by the bad press which "Modern Times" received as a result of the activities of Nichols and Edger, and tempted to give the whole venture up as a result of revived interest in his stereotyping inventions, which threatened to divert his attention from the field of social reform entirely for a time,[91] Warren remained attached to the little community. Following a brief trip to his home in New Harmony and a few months spent in Boston[92] in the winter of 1855-56, he returned to Long Island and remained there until late in 1862.

---

[89] Warren, a disbeliever in voting, was convinced that a form of society which depended upon the largest vote to decide its governor was "radically defective and unfit," and would inevitably result in a large segment of people being ruled against their wills. Elections, he felt, were but a "series of revolutions." *Periodical Letter,* I, 127.

[90] Warren was referring at this point to the provisions for the recapture of runaway slaves, not alleging that the institution itself was established by positive law. The common law theory used to justify the existence of slavery was regarded as preposterous by Warren and later anarchists. The major propositions of Warren's system, personal inviolability and right to the full total of one's production, made belief in possession of another as property untenable. For other remarks on slavery by Warren see *Periodical Letter,* II, 40, 50-51; I, 2nd. series, 104.

[91] Warren's wife, still in New Harmony, occasionally wrote encouraging him to abandon his activities in the East and return. Caroline Cutter Warren to Josiah Warren, May 27, June 27, 1855.

The spring of 1857 saw the arrival of new adherents, alleged "secessionists" from Brook Farm who became known as the "Boston Group." Among these were Charles A. Codman, Edward Linton, William U. Dame and several others and their families, one of whom was reputed to have been a treasurer of the famous Massachusetts community. The "Boston Group" contained among its members those who were to be the most tenacious of the "Modern Times" residents.[93]

"Modern Times," with its local currency, felt little of the shock of the panic of 1857.[94] Moncure Daniel Conway, a visitor there in the summer of this year,[95] testified to the economic and social harmony prevailing among the less than 200 inhabitants. More impressed by the unusual dress of the women and other social novelties, notably the unconcern toward marriage ties and the absence of both a court or jail,[96] Conway verified the operation of the cost economy and the use of the corn-backed labor note. At that time he observed that there appeared to be no concern over such evils as overissue and counterfeiting. For a time the labor notes exceeded the scope of their original intention. Used in transactions with citizens of neighboring towns, these notes became acceptable as payment for taxes for periods during the depression following the panic of this year.

---

[92] Warren spent the early part of 1855 in Boston as well, while engaged in promoting the use of his stereotyping process. Caroline Cutter Warren to Josiah Warren, January 10, January 26, 1855.

[93] For further on the "Boston Group" see Codman, "History of Modern Times"; G. B. Studley to William H. Ross, July 11, 1930, both in Modern Times papers at Suffolk County Historical Society. Codman made a living as a maker of paper and wooden boxes. No evidence exists of a paper box factory supposedly operated by Linton, as mentioned by Bailie in his *Josiah Warren*. Codman specifically mentioned that there was no factory or industrial establishment there at any time, and that no source of power was present to make such a development possible. Thus such manufactures as were produced in the colony were the product of individual craftsmen. See addresses by Codman and Linton in *1855—Fifty Years After at Brentwood, Long Island, May 30, 1905*. The contents of this pamphlet were published in the *Brooklyn Standard Union*, June 4, 1905.

[94] Labor notes, approximately the size of current federal paper money, for one and two hours labor, are preserved in the Suffolk County Historical Society. Signed by Codman and P. I. Blacker, they proposed to be payable also in two other standards, eight pounds of corn per hour or ten cents in "U.S. coin, with consent of the holder." These are dated 1857 and show obvious signs of having circulated as currency, as does the note in the Workingmen's Institute Library at New Harmony, used fifteen years before. Codman, listed as a manufacturer of paper boxes, promised to pay in sign painting, Blacker in shoemaking. Blacker's limit of issue was fifty hours, Codman's, one hundred. Warren's name appears on the notes as printer.

[95] "The village," Conway reported, "consisted of about fifty cottages, neat and cheerful in their green and white, nearly all with well-tilled gardens." Conway, *Autobiography, Memories and Experiences*, I, 266.

[96] Conway, "Modern Times, New York," in *The Fortnightly Review*, I (July, 1865), 425. Conway noticed nothing extraordinary about the conduct of the residents other than a tendency toward reticence concerning each other's private affairs, which appeared to him to have grown out of the absence of traditional rules of social conduct and the freedom in marriage relationships.

The outbreak of the Civil War presaged the end of the 'Modern Times" experiment in some aspects, and its modification in others. The first two years saw little change in the life of the village other than an expansion of the program of education.[97] Warren advertised the beginning of an extensive training program in a number of trades and occupations, reflecting a continuation of the earlier stand he had taken against apprenticeships. The general public was invited to take part in the undertaking, although it appeared to be slanted toward attracting new residents, since much of the training offered favored trades and skills of especial advantage in the type of society which decentralism generally produced. The wide spread of interests included instruction in the playing of several musical instruments.[98] Not much evidence exists that this ambitious program was ever put into action, or that the degree of expected participation was realized.

The confusion, unrest and apprehension created by the war began to have effect upon many of the original members of "Modern Times," aggravated by rumors of heavy taxes and military draft plans during the latter part of the year 1862 and the first few months of the following year. Agitated by the violence and disruption which was becoming a part of the existence of many in all parts of the land, Warren published a curious tract, *Modern Government and Its True Mission, A Few Words for the American Crisis,* which advocated expedients greatly at variance with principles which have unalterable status among anarchists. A study of the work reveals a regression to functional aspects long taught by Robert Owen. In February, 1863, Warren went to Boston, and never returned to "Modern Times" again.

That same year, a number of the original settlers embarked from the island, bound for more peaceful lands,[99] but the colony persevered. Suspected of being a hot-bed of vice in the post-war period, "Modern Times" preserved most of its community spirit throughout the era, although by this time the use of the labor note had declined as the economy of New York became more pervading. Stalked by John B. Ellis[100] in the hopes of uncovering there a nest of "free-love," responses to questions revealed little change in spirit in the two decades of existence. "We mind our own business," declared an old resident:[101]

---

[97] For the origins of the school system at "Modern Times" see Dyson, *Century of Brentwood,* 90-92. Although outside influences had considerable responsibility in establishing the school, the overall impact of the community people was easily observed. Warren reported that only primary education was provided at first, supported by individual subscription. Each parent paid in proportion to the number of his children taught. Music and dancing were taught, along with formal subjects. Sex education and organized play became integral parts of the educative process during this early period, which set the system apart from that of nearby towns. Parental supervision and authority were not relaxed in proportion to the greater degree of social freedom enjoyed by the adults. Along with the early manual training, the objective was the development of a sense of responsibility at as early an age as appeared advisable; ". . . until they can regulate themselves they should be subject to some eye," Warren declared. *Periodical Letter,* I, 88; Noyes, *American Socialisms,* 100.

[98] Warren, *Modern Education,* 2. The stress on education was a life-long concern; "one well directed effort to promote an innocent amusement is worth two sermons against pernicious ones," summed up his philosophy on the place of teaching the use of leisure time. Warren, *A New System of Musical Notation,* 13.

> . . . the majority of people living in the village are legally married . . . but . . . our people don't look on marriage as absolutely necessary. . . . We still hold the doctrine of Individual Sovereignty. It is that which has drawn here nearly every person who has come here, except those who were attracted by Warren's Equitable Commerce. . . . We recognize every person's right to do as he pleases, so long as he does not harm his neighbor.

Despite the evident evolution of the radical community into a more and more conventional town, Ellis remained highly suspicious of its moral influence, remarking in the manner of Anthony Comstock:[102]

> That such a settlement, outwardly so attractive (for it is a pretty place) and yet so corrupt at heart, should exist almost within the shadow of the metropolis of the nation, is a circumstance full of danger.

Warren remained interested in "Modern Times" to his death. Although no longer connected with the community in any capacity, he was convinced that there was more to it than its critics had seen. Although begun as an experiment, he was pleased to see it still surviving when moved to comment upon it in 1872. Not revealing the source of his information, he remarked that the village was "a very pretty one, improving faster than any one in the neighborhood." After a recital of its increased physical attractions, he revealed his knowledge that the name had been changed. Since the very mention of "Modern Times" had often been a cause of provocation, now, he remarked "the annoyance from that source is at an end."[103] He did not indicate to his readers that the economic aspects of his internationally-known community were no longer of significance.

---

[99] Conway believed that part of the group went to South America. *Autobiography,* I, 268. See Chapter IV, note 63. Although many were opposed to war, later residents of Brentwood took pride in their fifteen members in the Union army.

[100] Ellis, a clergyman, visited "Modern Times" in 1869.

[101] Ellis, *Free Love and Its Votaries; or, American Socialism Unmasked,* 395-396. Warren's views on marriage while at "Modern Times" were unequivocal: "From twenty-nine years' constant contact with this subject, as one of the greatest of human interests to be ameliorated, I am entirely satisfied that no systematic or extensive changes can be suddenly made in the Marriage relations with safety." *Periodical Letter,* I (July, 1854), 13.

[102] Ellis, *Free Love,* 402.

[103] *Practical Applications,* 21.

Codman, who was to become the patriarch of the community and the last survivor of its early folk, was inclined to be critical of Warren. He located part of the failure to achieve greater prominence to Warren's poor qualities as a leader. He pointed up the latter's hesitancy and lack of command as a public speaker, his timidity and distaste for wrangling and discussion, and his general retiring nature. Warren "had no magnetic qualities so needful in persuasion of gaining converts," Codman asserted; "if he had had the gift or art of leadership, the fortune of this village . . . would have been different." Yet all was not gloom from Codman's point of view. His testimonial to the worth of "Modern Times" in his own "History" is unmatched in its positive quality:[104]

> As an Equity Village, 'twas a success as far as it went, and in its practical working no flaws were found in the principles as formulated by Mr. Warren. Nor were the principles ever successfully challenged. . . . None of us had the desire for riches. Equity was the ruling motive. That was what we were here to establish. Our aim was to show, by example, that better conditions for living were possible,—that Equity could be made actual, and that living could be made worth while. We may have been speculators in morality, but not in the land or its products. From the standpoint of worldly ambition, we failed, yet . . . we had . . . the cheering hope that our lives had not been entirely for self—that our social experiment might be a factor in the moralization of humanity, and that we had assisted in keeping alive the aspirations of social progress.

A few of the community people were still living in Brentwood after the turn of the century, with the pleasant external features of the town and the coöperative tendencies the primary attractions. However the buildings of the original settlement had for the most part long disappeared. Scarcely a physical vestige of "Modern Times" was to survive into the twentieth century.[105]

"Modern Times" as an experiment in practical anarchism is not easily evaluated. In a sociological sense, it is significant that no account, even including those of critics, has ever made mention of the presence at any time of crime as a community problem. The lack of disorder or violence in the absence of constituted authority for this extended period is a challenge to promoters of the widespread belief that organized society on any level without such formality is doomed to chaos. The modest size undoubtedly must be taken into consideration of this particular problem, however.

---

[104] Codman, "History of Modern Times."

[105] Warren's time store and apprentice shop had been demolished by 1890, and a like fate befell the community building, center of social affairs. A portion of the old school remains, but all other buildings have been destroyed, with a fine lack of historical feeling, in contrast to the meticulous preservation of New Harmony community sites in Indiana.

Indictments of the Warrenite settlement have usually concentrated on the non-coercive attitude toward its eccentrics and the lower material standard of living as compared with nearby New York City. From the point of view that institutions and attitudes of a particular group are more correctly judged with relation to their impact upon that group than upon the outside, neither of these contentions are particularly relevant. Adherents to Warren's assertion that group opinion determined the actual operation of a community, individual behavior at "Modern Times" was usually evaluated in the same terms, an essential corollary to a type of life founded upon unconditional respect for individual personality. As an old resident explained, the passive boycott became the principal weapon utilized against undesirables, a device of undisputed quality in their practical experience:[106]

> When we wish to rid ourselves of unpleasant persons, we simply let them alone. We buy nothing of them, sell them nothing, exchange no words with them—in short, by establishing a complete system of non-intercourse with them, we show them unmistakably that they are not wanted here, and they usually go away of their own accord.

A judgment of relative material prosperity is similarly of not especial consequence. No evidence exists to warrant the belief that the colonists expected to become wealthy or even well-to-do, while the statements of the colonists point to other factors, ranging from the expectation of merely proving theories in practice to the achievement of deliberate functional poverty, with its attendant sense of fulfillment. It is as planned retreats from the vitiating influences of city life that "Modern Times" and "Utopia" are of potential interest to modern proponents of decentralization. As an interlude in American social history the story of these towns stands apart from that of its cousins.

---

106. Ellis, *Free Love,* 398. Warren had great faith in the policy of aloofness toward undesirables. "It is a very repugnant undertaking," he wrote in 1855, "to point out this or that person to the community as a quack or an imposter, a fool or a fanatic, a cheat or a swindler; . . . we have no possible means of excluding such gentry from the Equity villages, . . . the only hope is in curing them by not giving them power or confidence." *Periodical Letter,* I, 101.

[Readers of the first edition of this book who have also had a wide acquaintance with science fiction have repeatedly pointed out the uncanny similarity between the economic structure and socio-political behavior of "Modern Times" and the space colony of unorganizable individualists described by Eric Frank Russell in his delightful and engaging novel, *The Great Explosion.* (See for example the Pyramid Books paperback edition, New York, 1963).]

CHAPTER IV

The Fragmentation and Decline of Anarchist Experimentation

Interest in the economic and social experimentation taking place at "Modern Times" was not confined to the New York Fourierites and the various unfriendly critics and denunciators frightened by the implications of the attack on the fundamental precepts of authority and the contemporary business system. The circulation of Warren's *Periodical Letter* and the publication of numerous letters in the London *Leader* dealing with sympathetic aspects of the equitable town on Long Island resulted in the development of a circle of proponents of the labor exchange principles in England.[1] It is significant that the leading members of this group were long associated with Robert Owen and William Thompson, although by the early 1850's they had transmuted the new interest in Josiah Warren into an attempted breach in Owenism.[2]

The readers of Owenite papers in England had become acquainted with the ideas of Warren over a period of two decades or more by this time.[3] From the point of view of practical operations, a much larger and more sympathetic audience existed in England, where labor exchange ideas were demonstrated on a larger scale than they ever were to be in America. About six months after the opening of the first Cincinnati time store in May, 1827, the first English trial along similar lines began in Brighton. The Co-operative Benevolent Fund Association, as it was known, established a central "repository" where members brought various articles of their own production. A designated committee issued orders payable in other commodities deposited by other members on a basis of equal value established on a scale which was constructed as close to original cost as could be determined. In the case where a person wished no products in supply, a labor note was issued to him which could be redeemed at a later occasion, "which note may be cancelled when articles of that value are issued for it, so that the labour notes may always represent the quantity of goods in store and work unrequited."[4]

---

[1] For a discussion of individualist anarchism in Europe and the influence of Warren and Benjamin Tucker in England, France, Belgium and Germany, see Nettlau, *Der Vorfrühling,* 125-132.

[2] Nettlau, *Anarquia,* 44.

[3] Nettlau, "Anarchism," 45.

The labor exchange brand of coöperation gained considerable headway during the next six years in London and Birmingham,[5] under the sponsorship of Owen and a gifted lieutenant, William Pare.[6] This culminated in the establishment of the memorable National Labour Exchanges in those cities in May and July, 1833.[7] Eminently successful despite their brief existence,[8] the underlying idea inexplicably went into eclipse, intellectually as well as practically. The political heat produced by the Chartist movement, which sought to be distinguished from this particular variety of "socialism,"[9] undoubtedly helped it into obscurity.

Fired by the establishment of "Modern Times" and influenced by Stephen Pearl Andrews' *Sovereignty of the Individual,* English interest in American anarchist decentralism revived, tempered by considerations peculiar to conditions in England. In 1853, a loose organization of these early scientific anarchists arose. Under the name of the London

---

[4] Podmore, *Robert Owen,* 386; quoted from *Cooperative Magazine,* November, 1827.

[5] Warren was fully aware of the activity in England leading up to the formation of the Equal Exchange bazaars. In his *Peaceful Revolutionist* of February 5, 1833 he published the following article:

> PROGRESS OF EQUAL EXCHANGE IN ENGLAND. The Working Man's Advocate of N.Y. Jan. 12, contains a letter written by Robert Owen to a friend in Liverpool dated at Birmingham Nov. 27 stating that there had been a meeting the day before and he says "I should think from eight to ten thousand persons were present. . . . An unanimous resolution was adopted by acclamation to establish the first provincial branch of the Labour Exchange in Birmingham." He also says "I am obliged to return to London. . . . I have to open a new branch establishment which has been preparing during my absence and only waits my return."

[6] Pare, a native of Birmingham and associated with the early beginnings of the English labor movement, became a complete convert to Owen's "new system," and delivered his first public lecture, in the capacity of corresponding secretary of the first Birmingham Coöperative Society, in the Mechanics' Institution in Manchester on March 30, 1830. Although he did not become an opponent of the trade union, he became convinced that the struggle by combination to keep money wages up was impotent and useless. Holyoake, *History of Co-operation,* II, 147, 254.

[7] The rise and fall of the National Equitable Labour Exchanges is adequately described in Holyoake, *History of Co-operation,* I, 159-172. See also Podmore, *Robert Owen,* 393-422. Owen's first opening actually took place September 17, 1832, following the success of a similar exchange begun in April of the same year by William King. One of the copper plates, from which the English labor notes of this period were printed, is in the collection of Owen material in the Workingmen's Institute Library.

[8] Speaking of the cupidity and violence produced by their operation, Holyoake remarked, concerning their suppression; "Despite the conflict of management, the inexperience which belong to all new schemes, the ignorance, the distrust and the jealousy which the new plan of commerce had to encounter, it attained to considerable organization . . . the child was well born, was of good promise, but was strangled as signs were appearing of lusty growth. Labor exchanges did not perish because they failed but because they succeeded." *History of Cooperation,* I, 174.

[9] Mark Hovell, *The Chartist Movement* (Manchester, England, 1918), 32.

Confederation of Rational Reformers, the philosophy of the group combined the ideas of Warren with others of their own, hoping to realize in a country-wide manner the decentralist society which the Americans were attempting in independent small communities.[10] William Pare continued to be a prominent associate of the London group, although his interests became distracted by agrarian coöperative enterprises in Ireland,[11] dividing his time between stays in London and Dublin.

The secretary and strong spirit of this new center of radicalism, for over thirty years occupied in some phase or other of the left wing reform movement in England, was Ambrose Caston Cuddon. Cuddon was actively corresponding with Warren early in the year the London Confederation began its extensive propaganda campaign,[12] which involved not only the use of Warren's stereotyping inventions as a means of disseminating their publications, but a reprinting of an English edition of *Equitable Commerce* as well.[13] The English supporters of Warren displayed little timidity in their efforts to spread their beliefs. Cuddon brought the matter to the attention of important political personages, including the prime minister, Lord Aberdeen.[14] While seeking support, Pare carried the story of the Warrenite villages and their basic operating principles before the reserved meetings of the Royal Statistical Society about two years later, in the summer of 1856. Explaining to his listeners Warren's use of the term "commerce" in the old English connotation of the whole of the proceedings of human relations, Pare described its potentialities in enthusiastic and engaging language:[15]

---

[10] The objectives of the English exponents of anarchism were outlined in two now exceedingly scarce publications, *A Contribution Towards the Elucidation of the Science of Society,* and *An Outline of the Principles, Objects, and Regulations of the London Confederation of Rational Reformers, founded in August, 1853, by a few Private Individuals of the Middle and Working Classes.* See Nettlau, "Anarchism," 50. On the influence of Warren's ideas upon members of this London group see also report in *London Leader,* October 15, 1853, reprinted in *Periodical Letter,* I (July, 1854), 13, which commended the London group for following "the policy and patient good sense of the American Reformers of Modern Times," and referring to their first tract as "a novelty in English democratic literature."

[11] See Pare's own account of the most important of these, *Cooperative Agriculture: a Solution of the Land Question as Exemplified in the History of the Ralahine Cooperative Agricultural Association, County Clare, Ireland* (London, 1870).

[12] Josiah Warren to Ambrose C. Cuddon, March 12, 1853; Warren MSS., Labadie Collection. It is probable that Cuddon is the author of the early publication of the London group, although neither carry the names on the cover or title page, according to Nettlau. See note 10, above. Cuddon also was an early associate of Robert Owen. See his outline of the objectives of the Home Colonization Society in Robert Owen, *A Developement* (sic) *of the Principles and Plans on Which to Establish Self-Supporting Home Colonies* (London, 1841), 48.

[13] *Periodical Letter,* II, 47-48. It is doubtful whether any of Warren's works were published in their entirety in Great Britain, despite the preparations which were made at this time.

[14] *Periodical Letter,* I, 94. Aberdeen was prime minister of a Conservative-Liberal coalition government from 1852-1855. Walter Phelps Hall and Robert Greenhalgh Albion, *A History of England and the British Empire* (New York, 1937), 642.

> It will be perceived by the acute intellect that a principle is here broached which is absolutely revolutionary to all existing commerce. Perhaps a few minds may follow it out at once to its consequences far enough to perceive that it promises the most magnificent results in the equal distribution of wealth proportional to industry—the abolition of pauperism—general security of condition instead of continual bankruptcy or poverty—universal co-operation—the general prevalence of commercial honor and honesty, and in ten thousand harmonizing and beneficent effects, morally and religiously.

English interest in the American trial villages remained on an intellectual level, despite a visit to both "Modern Times" and "Utopia" by Cuddon in June and July of 1857.[16] Although favorably impressed, his return to England resulted in no practical operations of any kind. Cuddon continued to head up the literary front in the London area, publishing articles with a strong anarchist flavor in the *Cosmopolitan Review* and the *Working Man* throughout most of 1861-1862. The escape of Michael Bakunin from Siberia and his subsequent arrival in London on January 10, 1862 provided another opportunity for Cuddon to associate with the radical movement, heading the delegation chosen to greet the prominent leader of the growing proletarian wing of the anarchists on the continent. Henceforth no uniformity prevailed among the members of this group. Cuddon took a prominent part in the London convention of August of this same year, at which the idea of the International Working Men's Association was broached publicly for the first time.[17] He continued his relations with Warren and the Americans to the end, however, attempting to introduce the former's ideas on land among the adherents of coöperation in England without effect.[18] Pare gradually drifted away from espousal of Warrenite principles into the camp of the Rochdale wing of coöperation, where he remained until his death in 1873,[19] but Cuddon's attachment remained strong. Now an old man and in straitened circumstances, his influence as a pamphleteer became negligible.[20]

---

[15] Pare, "Equitable Villages in America," in *Journal of the Statistical Society of London,* XIX, 143.

[16] *Periodical Letter,* I, 2nd series, 74. Cuddon's trip westward included a stay in Indiana at the home of a daughter.

[17] Nettlau, "Anarchism," 51; Edmond Villetard, *History of the International* (Susan M. Day, translator) (New Haven, 1874), 51-69. This gathering is not to be confused with the more famous one in London in September, 1864, from which time the Working Men's International Association properly stems. See also Arthur Müller Lehning, "The International Association, 1855-1859; A Contribution to the Preliminary History of the First International," in *International Review for Social History* (Leiden, Netherlands, 1936-), III (1938), 1-102, pp. 52-54.

[18] For a report of Cuddon on his activities at the Coöperative Congress of 1869, see his letter to Warren, June 21, 1869, in Warren MSS., Labadie Collection.

[19] Pare's death was impressively recorded at the 1873 Coöperative Congress at Newcastle-on-Tyne. Holyoake, *History of Co-operation,* II, 430.

Interest in American anarchist teachings in England was to remain dormant for over a decade after this, a revival taking place with the beginning of the journal *The Anarchist* in March, 1885, by Henry Seymour. Most of Seymour's group soon broke away and gathered around Peter Kropotkin, who began publication of the communist-anarchist *Freedom* in October of the next year.[21] Thereafter the followers of Warrenite anarchism in England were to be a minority fringe among the advocates of the autonomous collective commune.

The repeated appearances of Warren in the Boston area as a speaker between 1848 and 1852 met favorable response in more respects than the intellectual. Members of both the Ohio and Long Island towns were recruited there from time to time, the best-known being the "Boston Group."[22] It was also in the Boston area that the only prominent attempt at practical exposition of the equitable principles not begun by Warren took place. Its promise drew Warren himself away from Long Island for a time, during which he published a small sheet called the *People's Paper,*[23] devoted to a description of the proceedings, in the latter part of 1855-1856, before leaving to visit the equitists in Ohio.

Under the direction of men named Keith and Robinson, an attempt at forming a colony in the outskirts of Boston was made, but did not get beyond the stage of the selling of land lots at cost price.[24] Keith set up a cost-price "House of Equity" in the city, which served to illustrate one element of the cost economy, although there was no use made of the labor notes. Other stores similar to this were set up in other parts of the state, among them South Boston and Lawrence, and the Boston suburbs of Charlestown and Roxbury.[25] In many ways the conduct of the enterprises directed by Keith approached philanthropy rather than the system of cost exchange which Warren advocated and demonstrated. A businessman with investments in the Boston area as well as South America, his experimental stores passed on the savings to customers with little or no attempt to encourage the labor exchange among the patrons, as had been the practice of Warren in Cincinnati and New Harmony, as well as the mutualist towns. The destruction of the first Boston store by fire, closely followed by investment losses in overseas undertakings, brought about his withdrawal from active participation, but the independent equitable stores survived for some time afterward.[26]

---

[20] "You are aware that I have written a Treatise on the Science of Society in a Series of lectures, but which I could not afford to publish. Since then I have added much to them for I can think of nothing else but *our subject,* which in fact embraces every thing which regards the well being of mankind." Ambrose Caston Cuddon to Josiah Warren, September 15, 1873. Cuddon remarked that he was now 82 years of age but enjoyed life as much as ever "and more than ever, if I can get out my book."

[21] For a summary of this matter see article "The Oldest Paper on the Left," in *Freedom,* IX (April 3, 1948), 2. The first paper of this name suspended publication in 1927. In November, 1936 publication resumed under the title *Spain and the World,* changed successively to *Revolt!,* and *War Commentary,* reverting to the old name at the end of 1945.

[22] See advance notices and reports on Warren's lectures in *Boston Investigator,* June 25, July 2, July 9, August 20, September 24, October 8, October 22, 1851.

[23] *Periodical Letter,* II, 33.

[24] *Periodical Letter,* II, 34.

[25] Warren reported that the "House of Equity" was located in a seven story building, doing business to the amount of $1000 a day.

Warren was dismayed by the widespread use of the word "equity" which grew out of the success of Keith and his associates in their fragmentary demonstration of his ideas.[27] Speculators quickly grasped the popularity of the term and a rash of "Equity Eating Houses," "Equity Produce Cellars," and "Equity Stores" followed, while Warren ruefully noted that "original" Houses of Equity were "as plenty as blackberries."[28] For a time during the summer of 1856 a village was under consideration in Cliftondale, where from three to four hundred lots were surveyed and sold within three months. Warren himself considered constructing a building there,[29] apparently with a view to remaining there at least long enough to aid in the formation of a community similar to that on Long Island, but the withdrawal of the Keith group put these plans to an early end.

While the 1850's saw the propagation of native anarchist ideas by Warren and Andrews, this was also the period of the introduction into America of early European anti-statism by Wilhelm Weitling and Joseph Dejacque. Weitling, a German immigrant, rejected the principle of private property summarily,[30] which placed him in the opposite camp from the Warrenite Americans. After the failure of his communist community in Wisconsin, in 1853, he withdrew from the radical cause.[31]

---

[26] Warren printed with obvious pleasure the observation of the editor of the *Boston Post* upon the closing of the "House of Equity"; "There was, however, a principle in that store, which, though only partially developed, a thousand failures could not affect." *Periodical Letter,* II, 35.

[27] The cut-price system growing out of the Keith affair Warren considered misleading. "Cheapness to consumers may be great injustice and ruin to producers and venders. The principle of equivalents alone can regulate this important matter." Warren, *Equitable Commerce* (leaflet), 3-4.

[28] *Periodical Letter,* II, 36.

[29] Caroline Cutter Warren to Josiah Warren, July 20, 1856. Warren's wife considered the idea ill-advised.

[30] Clark, "A Neglected Socialist," 81. Weitling appears to have been influenced to a greater extent by the socialists Fourier and St. Simon than by Proudhon. Although rejecting with the latter the right of occupation solely as the basis of property ownership, his plan for the reorganization of society is founded upon an analysis of human nature similar to that of the former. Kaler, *Wilhelm Weitling,* 77, 79, 83.

[31] Clark, "A Neglected Socialist," 79; Kaler, *Wilhelm Weitling,* 74. There is some ground for doubt that Weitling considered the abolition of the state but, like several German and French Socialists, conceived it as a device for bringing about the organization of the society which they planned. Zenker, *Anarchism,* 30.

Dejacque, arriving from France, made New York his center of operations, and published the first journal of communist anarchism in America, *Le Libertaire,* from 1858 to 1861.[32] At first a follower of Proudhon, Dejacque broke away, reproducing the philosophy of the stateless commune in *Le Libertaire* during the years 1858-1859 under the title "L'Humanisphere," which was later collected and published as a single work in Brussels in 1899.[33] Important in the study of the beginnings of nineteenth century anarchist thought, Weitling and Dejacque had little influence in the United States, and their impact upon the native group was undiscernible. Not until the time of the formation of the I.W.M.A.[34] following the collapse of the Paris Commune were anarchist doctrines of alien origin to obtain a following among American radicals.

The continuation and intensification of war conditions had another effect besides dispersing many of the original settlers from "Modern Times"; Warren's retreat was brought about as well. Retiring to Boston in despair in 1863, he spent most of the year writing his first full-length work, which summarized the philosophy and practical accomplishments of his thirty-nine years in the field of economic and social reform. Published under the title *True Civilization*[35] in this same year, this volume was unique among his works in the scope of its attention to contemporary problems created by the war. It also disclosed a regression to the support of methods of social control which he first became acquainted with while with the Owenites at New Harmony in 1825-1826.

A prominent feature of the educational system which had been under consideration at New Harmony at that time was the presence of a semimilitary force among the young of the group, drilled in military tactics and created for the purpose of supplying the community with protection from invasion by unfriendly outside elements.[36] Owen had been enough of a realist to anticipate the possibility of aggression, which thus made preparation for protection a vital part of community action. Believing that war would eventually be cast aside as a policy when societary reformation had taken place, there still remained the necessity for providing for the dangerous period of transition immediately ahead.[37] Although this plan had gone quickly into obscurity due to the brief duration of the Owenite settlements, the idea remained with Warren for almost two score years before being once more proposed.[38] Provoked now by the presence of so much militarism, and surrounded on all sides by a behavior pattern which reflected on the whole the violence of the conduct of war, Warren displayed his disillusionment by now admitting, in the case of society as a whole, the necessity for the presence of a military group on a temporary basis,[39] which he thought could consist of either policemen or soldiers.

---

[32] *Le Libertaire* was published from June 9, 1858 to February 4, 1861, a total of 27 numbers appearing during that time. Max Nettlau to Agnes Inglis, April 11, 1931, Nettlau MSS., Labadie Collection; Müller Lehning, "The International Association," 46, note. See also Kropotkin, article "Anarchism," in *Encyclopedia Britannica,* XI ed., I, 918.

[33] Nettlau, *Esbozo de Historia de las Utopias,* 48. Nettlau was of the opinion that Dejacque arrived at his anarchist beliefs independently of Proudhon, while Zenker maintained that he first was a Proudhonian. See Nettlau, *Bibliographie,* 30-32, 56; same author, "Anarchism: Communist or Individualist?—Both," in *Freedom,* XXVIII (March, 1914), 21; Zenker, *Anarchism,* 241.

[34] For Dejacque's part in the early beginnings of the I.W.M.A. see Müller Lehning, "The International Association," 44-50; Nettlau, *Der Vorfrühling,* chapter XXIV.

[35] Warren published three different works whose titles contained these two words, a matter of considerable confusion to bibliographers. The distinction can be clearly made by consultation of the sub-titles. The volume produced in 1863 was scheduled for a second edition of 1872 as *True Civilization Part II,* but no copies have ever been discovered of this latter proposed release. Page citations from the 1863 edition will hereinafter be designated as *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity.*

[36] Owen stated that part of the education of the young at New Lanark also had this objective in mind; ". . . the children of these work-people were

The architect of scientific anarchism in America carefully distinguished between the terms in general use and the connotations they carried in the free type of society which he advocated and had been striving to introduce through the medium of the autonomous local community. "Government," he said, "strictly and scientifically speaking, is a coercive force; a man, while governed with his own consent, is not governed at all."[40] In a similar manner he differentiated between the act of being "within" and "under" discipline; the former he declared was the situation prevailing in the voluntary community, while the latter, considered

---

taught and exercised in military discipline, to teach them habits of order, obedience, and exactness, to improve their health and carriage, and to prepare them at the best time, in the best manner, when required, to defend their country at the least expense and trouble to themselves." *The Life of Robert Owen by Himself* (New York edition, 1920), 319-320. With relation to New Harmony see also the short summary in Nicholson, *The Hoosiers,* 109.

[37] "If it should be possible for an enemy to exist, in opposition to a population known to act upon millennium principles, war may always be prevented, by those who adopt the principles of peace, being, at all times, prepared to resist injustice and oppression; and this preparation may be easily effected by wise arrangements in the education of the young, without any trouble or expense, that would not be amply repaid." Owen, *A Development of the Principles and Plans on Which to Establish Self-Supporting Home Colonies,* 6. See also same author, *A New View of Society; or, Essays on the Principle of the Formation of the Human Character,* 105-112.

[38] Warren developed some of the ideas which he had first expressed in the pamphlet *Modern Government* written at "Modern Times" the year before.

[39] In some respects the doctrine was a recapitulation of Owenism; "The whole mission of coercive government being the defense of persons and property against offensive encroachments, it must have force enough for the purpose. This force necessarily resolves itself into the military, for the advantage of drill and systematic cooperation; . . . this being perhaps the best form that government can assume, while a coercive force is needed." *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 15; *Modern Government,* 4. The qualification as to the time element was even more explicitly the doctrine of his early teacher; ". . . this Modern Military, as a Government, will be necessary only in the transitionary stage of society from confusion and wanton violence to true order and mature civilization." *Modern Government,* 15.

[40] *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 28; *Modern Government,* 11-12.

conventionally desirable, he likened to being under instead of within water.[41] In a third instance he separated the concepts of leadership and what he called the "deciding power."[42] Leadership, he declared, was a state of affairs which inhered in the free consent of a voluntarily assembled group of persons. Agreement preceded leadership; a six year old boy could give the final order to nine adult men who were in agreement as to the necessity and desirability of picking up a log. On a more complex level the principle remained the same. When the act of leading impinged upon the act of deciding, which Warren considered an individual matter exclusively, the invasion created an artificial situation, and as a result coercion became an inevitable course of action.

If men were to have "government," an agreement as to principles had to be made; opportunism as the basis of society was an admission that barbarism was the inevitable and normal condition of man.[43] If the search for principles was undertaken, Warren felt that statements of colonial times were adequate; "I venture to assert that our present deplorable condition . . . is in consequence of the people in general never having perceived, or else lost sight of, the legitimate object of all governments as displayed or implied in the American 'Declaration of Independence.' "[44] This document, he contended, contained the entire essence of the "democratic idea," and constituted the base of all American institutions, however "caricatured" and "distorted" they had become as a result of ignoring it.[45] The admission of the rights of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" was to Warren an admission of the indestructible principle of the individuality of persons and a restraint upon govrenments as to the limits of their extension.

The ends of society according to Warren were two: permanent, universal peace and the security of both person and property.[46] With reference to the latter, each individual exercised absolute authority here, and the mission of government was solely to insure the continuation of peace and to repel invasions of individual rights:[47]

> . . . it is not the true function of governments to prescribe opinions, either moral, religious, or political; to meddle with manufactures or importations; to prescribe the cut of the citizen's hair, the employment of his time, or the disposal of his life or his property, but simply to protect him against such impertinences.

"Coincidence must be had before anything requiring the coöperation of numbers can be properly done," Warren admitted, but positive governmental institutions erred in believing that coöperation could be approached in any other manner than by degrees.[48] Governments merely produced chaos by treating diversity of views as dangerous to the "public welfare," and punishing by imprisonment and death the expression of divergence, in act and opinion, from their desired uniformity of behavior.[49] Constitutions were "defective generalizations,"[50] he held, the rules of which were valid and effective only when applied to specific situations and specific places. "Self-sovereignty in every individual is my constitution" was Warren's reply to apprehension as to the effect of individual judgment of legislation upon "law and order."[51] Natural law, when violated, brought its own punishment. The state of lawlessness prevailing in the social structures of man's construction was unknown in nature, and freedom was all that was needed for the individual to discover the fact for himself.

---

[41] *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 27.

[42] T*rue Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 128-129, 135.

[43] *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 43.

[44] *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 10-11.

[45] "The democratic idea," Warren charged, "has never been introduced into our military discipline, nor into our courts, nor into our laws, and only in a caricatured and distorted shape into our political system, our commerce, our education and public opinion." *Modern Government,* 9.

[46] *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 14.

[47] *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 169-170.

All this Warren advanced in support of his plea for the free society, but he admitted that in the present condition of the nation, the ideals of violence were too deeply rooted to make any consideration of natural living feasible. A new approach attended the changing of accepted attitudes, and Warren, believing that the war was about to plunge the North as well as the South into a state of deterioration and inversion little above the level of barbarism, proposed alternative agencies capable of being utilized as auxiliaries in the event of a stalemate or breakdown. One of these was a system of deliberative bodies which approximated the formal courts, the personnel to consist of "counsellors" who for the most part were expected to be the elders of the community.[52] Serving without salary until their services had been supplied, and then only compensated by voluntary contributions, it was Warren's belief that such councils might settle the mass of community troubles without recourse to violence or punitive measures of any type. It was his conviction that such "counsellors in equity" had social and educational as well as legal functions to serve, contributing to intelligent public opinion by airing the disputes of the citizenry in an intelligent manner before all who cared to be present.[53] In the case of crimes involving violence or aggression, it was deemed more important to investigate the causes, thus arriving at appropriate and practical means of prevention[54] rather than

---

48. *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 145.
49. *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 129.
50. *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 137-138.
51. *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 54, 152.
52. *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 29-30; *Modern Government,* 12.
53. *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 108.
54. In considering the phenomenon of crime, Warren leaned heavily upon the Owenite thesis of environmentalism to the exclusion of his own stress upon individuality and responsibility. Witness his conclusions relative to the preventative function of the new legislative bodies:

"When the simply wise shall sit in calm deliberation, patiently tracing out the complicated and entangled causes of avarice, of robberies, of murders, of relying upon the supposed inhibitory influence of punitive action, at best retaliatory and negative in effect. Granting that disorder and encroachment were bound to occur which could not possibly be neutralized by the action of the non-invasive tribunals, Warren was hesitant and vague as to the extent to which force might be made recourse. At most he sanctioned the formation of parallel bodies of militia[55] trained in preventive techniques and the use of restraint in the protection of person and property, in the event of collapse of the familiar civil order. Still convinced that social ills were a complex product and not the result of a streak of diabolism present within a portion of humanity, he was still hesitant as to how far society's agents might be permitted to go in penalizing[56] actions which might be considered harmful.

When compared with the brutal realities of the mid-Civil War period, Warren's suggestions for remedial action appeared simple and naïve to hardbitten thinking in terms of the techniques of power. Critics might hold that his free society postulated the existence of a rather high type of human material with which to work, and dismiss his constructive recommendations with no further hearing. Associates and sympathizers on the other hand looked with favor upon his condemnation of national and sectional patriotism,[57] the recourse to war as an instrument of public policy, and the glorification of its destructive efficiency[58] while engaged

---

wars, of poverty, of desperation, of suicides, of slaveries and fraud, violence and suffering of all kinds, and shall have found appropriate and practical means of preventing instead of punishing them, then the military will be the fitting messengers of relief and harbingers of security and peace . . ." *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 34.

[55] *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 15, 18, 24-27; *Modern Government,* 13. Warren's transitional military force combined in its training a number of provoking elements, among them a course of discipline allowing for independent decisions upon the part of the members when matters involving affairs properly beyond their scope were involved. Part of the drill was to include the giving of orders permitting the commission of unnecessary harm with the express purpose of having the orders disobeyed. The moral culpability of soldiers acting under orders was to come under scrutiny some 80 years later with the trials of German military personnel at Nürnberg at the end of World War II.

[56] "If the sole proper function of coercive force is to restrain or repair all unnecessary violence, then the conclusion is inevitable that all penal laws for punishing a crime or act after it is committed, except so far as they work to compensate the injured party equitably, are themselves criminal." *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 39.

[57] Warren considered the logical conclusions of patriotism ominous. The polarization of the world's peoples into nations was to him the prelude to "signing a death-warrant" in the case of individuals within them, and sure oblivion to refuse to belong to any. *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 47. For Warren as a contributor to anti-war thought, see Merle Curti, *Peace or War; The American Struggle 1636-1936,* p. 59.

[58] "Even in mechanism the arts of destruction have gone beyond those of preservation; and the best military commander is announced, without blushing, to be he who can most adroitly mislead, deceive, entrap, and kill his fellow men, who are at least his equals in every view of manhood and worth. And these are the model precedents and model men held up for imitation by the coming generations!" *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 42.

in the annihilation of the individual personality.[59]

In the summer of 1864, Warren moved to Cliftondale once more, resuming for a time his previous labors toward beginning another mutual town there,[60] building upon the remains of the Keith essay of almost ten years before. At the same time he renewed the campaign of propaganda in the interests of decentralization, proposing the erection of a number of parallel communities.[61] The "new cities" were to be located as close to existing communities "as the prices of land and the facilities of intercourse will permit," and were to involve a greater degree of planning of the physical appearance. In order to avoid the elements of discord created at "Modern Times" in its early days and to promote esthetic considerations, he suggested the mapping out of the nucleus intensively, including the streets and sidewalks, the entire area to be figured as a single unit when being settled in the contract of purchase.[62] It was also recommended that the location of the industries contemplated be determined and that a central area designated as a common recreation center, inspired by his observations of the Boston Public Garden, become a prominent feature of any plan.

Continuing to reflect the pessimism toward the future that had filled *True Civilization,* and looking forward to disintegration on a large scale as a consequence of the war, Warren had firm convictions that the Jeffersonian concept of cities as the sores of society was still correct, and that the adjustment of human affairs awaited the simplification of social organization. Anticipating an exodus from the country, and continuing relations with the earlier residents of "Modern Times" who had sought escape from the war by fleeing to the Caribbean area, he at the same time made preliminary preparations for the setting up of similar colonies in Jamaica and Central America.[63]

The attempts at practical resumption of the equity movement were destined to be rendered ineffective. The physical and spiritual exhaustion and the widespread apathy of the first few years after the war proved too disheartening a soil to furnish the Warrenite ideas with sustenance. No outside support for his plans materialized; the Caribbean project languished; while Warren himself and a few friends continued a fragmentary association in Cliftondale and Boston, with a shrinking total of results to show for their efforts. For a time the publication of the

---

[59] *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 48-50, 53, 170-171. Disinterested in the political issues with which the term "secession" was connected, Warren always used the term loosely; he considered the act of a slave running away from his master as much a matter of "secession" as the desertion of the Union by a state.

[60] See Notebook "D," entry dated July 4, 1864, for extensive plans for reviving the labor exchange with residents of Charlestown as well.

[61] Warren, *The Emancipation of Labor,* 2.

[62] *The Emancipation of Labor,* 3.

[63] *The Emancipation of Labor,* 8.

Quarterly Letter[64] kept alive the intellectual aspect of the decentralist movement with practically no other support than that of a handful of old friends, but by 1869 the impulse toward investigation of the possibilities of the labor exchange in a non-coercive and autonomous individualist community situation vanished.

While Warren had been circularizing friends and potential participants in a renewal of practical demonstration of "equitable commerce" during the last year of the war, a Massachusetts protagonist had written:[65]

> Your plan of beginning a movement I do not feel competent to express an opinion upon. It seems to me that the public mind must in some way, by books, papers, or lectures be indoctrinated with the true principles more before much can be done. I am ready and very desirous to do all I can for the great cause.

By the latter part of the 1860's such an intellectual campaign had begun. Consisting for the most part of younger men and disillusioned veterans of a variety of reform movements, a loose group of radicals had begun a study of the literature and philosophy of opposition to the state and its centralizing effect upon the economic activities of the nation, which the struggle for control of political power and support by industrial, financial, and laboring interests presaged. Destined to be looked upon as intractable extremists for their insistence in basing their arguments upon principles and premises which excluded participation in political organization, they undertook an intensive examination of the writings of not only Josiah Warren but other dissident individualists of prominence such as William B. Greene, Lysander Spooner, Joshua K. Ingalls and their associates.

Not satisfied with this alone, the men themselves were sought out and brought together into two loose federations which became known as the New England Labor Reform League and the American Labor Reform League. It was to these associations that the initiative in the dissemination of native anarchist thought passed. The active influence of Warren, now a man of over 70 years of age, having become stilled, still his association with the Reform Leagues was eagerly solicited. It was as the intellectual patriarch of these groups that he spent the rest of his life, where his infrequent words were given attention and his name always mentioned with respect. It was probably at the inducement of Ezra Heywood, around whom the Reform Leagues centered for a time, that he revised, edited and enlarged his first work, *Equitable Commerce,* and published it for the fourth time while still at Cliftondale in 1869 under the title of *True Civilization: A Subject of Vital and Serious Interest to*

---

[64] It is improbable that Warren continued publication of this journal later than the end of 1867. Issues dated later than this are thus far unlocated.

[65] Eugene Hutchinson to Josiah Warren, July 10, 1864, Warren MSS., Labadie Collection.

all People but Most Immediately to Men and Women of Labor and Sorrow.[66]

For the most part the revision contributed nothing new to the body of native anarchist thought, although there were several clarifications of previous positions, and indications of considerable reading in both history and jurisprudence. Having already made the mistake of combining their interests too closely, it appeared to Warren that being governed by the dictates of the greatest number was probably the best of a number of expedients, but gravely dangerous to the security of both person and property.[67]

He believed that political theorists explaining majority rule were eminently unsound in supposing that a concurrence of the vote indicated any such phenomenon as a "general will." The many hidden diversities of the individual personality, when multiplied by the number of persons taking part in any given election, created a huge barrier against any such expectation of coincidence.[68] Unless political systems provided unlimited opportunity for the freedom to differ,[69] the attainment of social harmony was impossible and an invitation to the use of force in an attempt to obtain accord. Hence the erection of a "soulless phantom" called the state, in whose name men acted without having any conception of what it was, at the same time escaping the responsibility for acts which they would never have done as private individuals. When the leaders of the French Revolution spoke of "crimes against the state," Warren declared that such phrases were nothing more than the conjurings of a "barbarian imagination" which were later used to absolve murderers of the responsibility for their crimes.[70] Advocates of community of property were no better[71] than the exponents of other types of "organized" society, he held; sinking the individual beneath his institutions was a course of action which was bound to frustrate the achievement of harmony.

The production of *True Civilization* was the last of Josiah Warren's activities in Cliftondale; his removal to Boston shortly after for the most part brought the period of experimentation in the practical aspects of American individualist anarchism to a close. His voice was henceforth to be a minor one during the early years of an unusually vigorous interest in the political and economic implications of anarchist philosophy, a period characterized by a great volume of published works and intellectual absorption in abstract considerations. The growth of Warren's stature as an exponent of native American radical thought has been partially alluded to, but his followers for over fifty years after his death paid profuse tribute to the character of his life and the value of his contribution to the thought and the literature of freedom.

---

[66] This edition bore the designation "Part I" on the cover page, being essentially the first of Warren's larger writings on the subject of his thought and action.

[67] *True Civilization, Part I,* 25.

[68] *True Civilization, Part I,* 23-24, 34.

[69] "Having the liberty to differ does not make us differ, but on the contrary, it is a common ground upon which all can meet, . . . giving full latitude to every experiment (at the cost of the experimenters), brings everything to a test, and insures a harmonious conclusion . . . the more liberty there is to differ, and take different routes, the sooner will all come to . . . the right one; . . ." *True Civilization, Part I,* 26.

[70] *True Civilization, Part I,* 27. In a similar manner he had repudiated what he termed "barbarian laws of war" which made all the members of a nation at war with all those of another. See *True Civilization an Immediate Necessity,* 58-59.

[71] *True Civilization, Part I,* page cited above.

Josiah Warren died on April 14, 1874 at the home of Edward Linton, a ship carpenter, anarchist convert and former associate of Warren's at "Modern Times," in the Bunker Hill district of Charlestown, Massachusetts. A substantial half-column obituary in the *Boston Globe* the following day reported that he had been ill for some time but did not mention the cause of death. A mysterious aspect of the account was the total absence of any mention of Warren's forebears and surviving members of his family, customary materials to be found in obituaries. The largest part of the story was devoted to his already legendary experiences from New Harmony through "Modern Times," and a serious and respectful summary of his philosophy, and concluded with a gentle tribute: "He was of a kindly disposition, and leaves a large circle of friends to lament his death."[72]

---

[72] *Boston Globe,* April 15, 1874. Warren had been preceded in death by his wife, Caroline Cutter Warren, in Evansville, Indiana, in 1872, and by his elder brother, George, in Cincinnati in the same year. For other related matters, see Appendix II.

JOSIAH WARREN

EZRA HEYWOOD

LYSANDER SPOONER

BENJAMIN R. TUCKER

CHAPTER V

Heralds of the Transition to Philosophical Egoism I

Warren's declining years found a revival of interest in his economic and social ideas. A new group of agents in the propaganda of native anarchism was now upon the scene. The emphasis had by this time broadened to include the exponents of other elements of libertarian reform, and the stress was now to manifest itself as a more intellectual rather than purely practical development. There still remained a strong inclination toward expression in the tradition of the second quarter of the century, but the dislocations in all aspects of life produced by the Civil War extended to the radical front as well as to the structure of the conventional domestic economy. The war enormously accentuated centralization of manufacturing, commerce and finance. It hastened the disposal of the national domain. It increased the scope of governmental functions in a variety of ways, which opponents of the state sensed rather than felt. All these incidents contributed toward the creation of the social and economic circumstances which were to become the new battle ground of American opposition to the state.

The literature of anarchism now incorporated the efforts of not only Warrenite disciples such as Stephen Pearl Andrews and Ezra Heywood but also more distant and independent associates, William B. Greene, J. K. Ingalls and Lysander Spooner, whose anti-statist sentiments took divergent paths but retained the same spirit. The dozens of books and pamphlets published by this small group of men constitute one of the lost branches of American literature and form the basis for a unique incident in the social history of nineteenth century United States.

The consummation of the abolitionist movement released into other areas of reform a group of earnest men seeking another cause, unconvinced that the destruction of chattel slavery had brought about the millennium. The new group of anarchists had all participated in the fight against negro servitude, in varying degrees, having been allied to the Garrisonian school. The purely negative doctrines of no-government which had permeated the non-political wing of the anti-slavery movement undoubtedly influenced all these men. Nevertheless, pre-Civil War America had been the scene of tremendous economic unrest, the bloom of Fourierite socialism being but one of the forms in which it had expressed itself. Thus the acquaintance with economic issues tempered the moralism of abolition in the case of the anti-state libertarians, who found little satisfaction in pure negation and avoidance of embarrassing material questions now brought into relief and side-stepped by the abolitionists as a whole. They had long been aware of the distress of the "free" Northern worker in the pre-war era, and now sought the cause of his misery in the economic structure of society. Going back to elementary principles of political economy, Warren's successors indicted the state in a more elaborate manner, tracing the origins of practically all derangement within the material community to politically-created artificial advantages.

Although not allied in any formal sense, the exponents of the "free society" remained in accord on basic principles which Warren had attempted to demonstrate with varying degrees of success and satisfaction to himself. Their concern centered around an economic order in which the producer would obtain the full total of his production, the development of a system of exchange geared to the cost of production in labor-time, and utilization of land and raw materials on the strict basis of occupation and actual employment. Convinced of the justice of such objectives, the anarchists proposed to prove that such an order was possible from natural conditions, and that the machinery of government succeeded in merely upsetting that which found its own level without special interference or legislation.

Having declared their position, their battle line was drawn up against the specific evils which they designated as the causes of disaffection within the economic community. In their ideal economy, which involved production for use, and free competition so as to find the lowest possible production cost, the existence of anything approximating monopoly and special privilege of all kinds constituted their primary target, and their ultimate attack upon the state grew out of location of the privilege-granting power in the group in control of the machinery of the state. Thus they designated as legislative favoritism the acts of granting exclusive rights to the ownership of land and raw materials, the legal sanction of a particular commodity as the only permissible tender, and the creation of more subtle forms of privilege concealed in tariffs, patents, and copyrights. With the erection of small bodies of special interests whose efforts in the future would thus be devoted toward preserving such perquisites, the anarchists tended to look with undisguised skepticism upon all efforts to repair the continual malfunctioning of the economic system by piecemeal legislation. The resulting temporary expedients might prove highly gratifying to politicians and to supporters of the business world masquerading as "reformers," they observed, but as far removed from basic principles as before the changes were put into operation.

Differences of opinion existed among the anarchists as to the relative importance of the evils which they saw as productive of most of the distemper of human society. For the most part they persisted in bringing their ideas before the literate public as individuals, although two vigorous attempts at gathering their efforts under unified auspices occurred during the 40 years immediately following the termination of the war. The first of these, Ezra Heywood's publishing activities, which used Princeton, Massachusetts as its headquarters, spread out over the 25 year period from 1869 until 1893. In many ways it furnished the stimulus to Benjamin Tucker, whose better known venture in the propagation of anarchism spanned over a quarter century, from 1881 to 1908. Both able writers in their own right, their productions cannot easily be separated from their functions as clearing houses for those of their intellectual associates.

1. *Ezra Heywood, Pamphleteer*

The return of Josiah Warren to Boston early in 1863 and his subsequent influence upon segments of the radicals of the city and its vicinity has been noted. It was in this same year that he was to meet the young Garrisonian abolitionist Ezra Heywood and turn the latter's efforts into the more obscure channel of radical economic thought. Heywood, a native of Westminster, Massachusetts, and the recipient of two academic degrees from Brown University,[1] had become associated with William Lloyd Garrison in February, 1858,[2] entering into the anti-slavery movement in Boston with considerable vigor. Having previously abandoned training for the ministry, he disassociated himself from the cause of negro freedom with the outbreak of hostilities in 1861, being also a nonresistant and an opponent of violence.[3] The outbreak of bloodshed ended his support of the Northern cause, although he continued to deprecate slavery, and inconsistently, to rejoice in later years at its destruction by the means which he most deplored.

A man without a cause, his meeting with Warren and the reading of the latter's *True Civilization* brought about his conversion to the search for the cause of the general phenomenon of poverty. Destined to exceed the master in degree of extremity in his proposals and, on two occasions in particular, to draw from him severe expressions of criticism, Heywood never was to renounce his devotion and respect for Josiah Warren. Twenty-five years after their first acquaintance Heywood was to pronounce Warren "the Thomas Paine of coming Socialism," and to assert his work "the most influential book issued since 1840 in the United States or Europe."[4]

---

[1] Boston *Globe,* May 23, 1893. Heywood's birthplace has generally been located at Princeton, Mass., until recent data received from a daughter verified other conclusions. See Ceres Haywood Bradshaw to Agnes Inglis, November 15, 1947, in Labadie Collection. A short biographical sketch stressing Heywood's position in the early civil liberties fight written by Zechariah Chafee, Jr., is in *Dictionary of American Biography,* VIII, 609-610.

[2] See Heywood's letter of November 29, 1877 to *The Index,* VIII, 573; Alfred E. Giles to Benjamin R. Tucker, July 25, 1878, in Tucker, (ed.), *Proceedings of the Indignation Meeting Held in Faneuil Hall, Thursday Evening, August 1, 1878, to Protest Against the Injury Done to the Freedom of the Press by the Conviction and Imprisonment of Ezra H. Heywood,* 56.

[3] Heywood was a student at Brown from September, 1852 until February, 1858. He first became acquainted with Garrison and *The Liberator* through a boarding house associate and friend of Garrison's wife. *Lucifer,* IX (May 20, 1892), 3. For his anti-war stand in 1863, se Curti, *Peace or War,* 76-77.

Heywood was unwilling to remain with Warren, or to take any part in the last attempts at colonization which were being contemplated at Cliftondale. The rising wind of unrest had begun to sweep through the industrial workers of the land, heavily-industrialized Massachusetts being concerned no less than any other area. Into the confusion of ideas and suggestions for remedial action, Heywood was content to project the philosophy of Warren's decentralized free economy. Leaving Boston, he went to Worcester, where his influence among the radical intellectuals was soon evident. Meetings of like-minded thinkers resulted in the formation in August, 1867, of the Worcester Labor Reform League,[5] the first of a large number of groups of the unconventionally-minded which Heywood was to front, and the forerunner of two larger and more important organizations of similar purpose.

The bright promise of unionization drew the support of this band for a time. William Sylvis' National Labor Union, the first noteworthy post-Civil War labor organization, appeared to point the way during their first year. The Worcester group unofficially affiliated for a time, Heywood attending the second session as a delegate at the "New York Congress" of the N. L. U. in New York, September 21, 1868.[6] Association with Warren's ideas had already weakened any faith he may have had as to the permanence of any gain effected through combination of laborers, however, and there is no evidence that his sympathy with the cause of workingmen found any expression at this time.[7]

Before members of the Worcester associates, later that same year, he began to sketch the philosophy which he had been gradually assimilating. In an address later published under the title *The Labor Party,*[8] he expressed many of the convictions which were to be found in native anarchist literature for the next half century. Heywood still spoke the language of political action, although condemning governmental policies as responsible for much of the disjointed relations between capital and labor, heightening class consciousness, bitterness, and violence. The address is important more as a document in the literature of industrial protest than as a philosophical treatise. Thus he asserted:[9]

---

[4] *The Word,* XVII (January, 1889), 2.

[5] See the account by Heywood in William B. Greene, *Mutual Banking,* (1870 ed.), preface, iii.

[6] Heywood was one of the 83 delegates present. Land and money reformers predominated at this meeting. Commons, *Documentary History,* IX, 197; Charlotte Todes, *William H. Sylvis and the National Labor Union* (New York, 1942), 99-100.

[7] See however, Heywood's letter in the *Workingman's Advocate,* June 20, 1868, on the suspended publication of labor papers, including the Boston *Voice* and the New York *National Workman.*

[8] This was written in 1868 and published in New York, and was probably his first work on money and labor reform.

> No one will deny that labor is entitled to its earnings, and that it is the duty, both of individuals and society, . . . to render unto all men and women according to their works. Let us also bear in mind that class rule, the centralizing of political or financial power in the hands of few, to the injury of many, is wrong, and that law . . . should cover with the shield of its protection the whole people, especially defenseless workers. It is the violation or these simple, self-evident truths which provokes the widespread, profound and ominous agitation called the labor movement.

Agitation for "labor reform," he pointed out, was evidence of deep and widespread discontent growing out of "violated rights and interests" and a situation in which the "producing classes" were being economically depressed. It was reasonable to assume, said Heywood, that a society in which those who created the wealth but failed to enjoy their proper share of it was 'wrong side up," and the labor reform movement was a move in the direction of setting it aright.

He scoffed at supporters of the status quo, who saw no evidence of the exercise of tyranny on the part of capital, and who brought up the matter of the free contract with reference to laborers. This argument was no longer valid. Capital controlled land, machinery, steam power, waterfalls, ships, railways, and above all, money and public opinion, and was in a position to wait out recalcitrancy at its leisure. The press quietly ignored the driving down of wages, he noticed:[10]

> But if labor, obedient to a sterner necessity, demands more pay, the air swarms with "strike," "dictation," "force," "riot," "insurrection," and many other epithets of rebuke . . .

Nor did the adverse sentiment end here;[11] ". . . nine sermons out of ten take the side of capital against labor." Heywood did not subscribe to the theory of inevitable class conflict. He traced the source of all the evils to legislation, primarily through the creation of special interests by monopoly grants and by exercise of the taxing power:[12]

> Government is a northeast wind, drifting property into a few aristocratic heaps, at the expense of altogether too much democratic bare ground. Through cunning legislation, . . . privileged classes are allowed to steal largely according to law.

---

[9] Heywood, *The Labor Party,* 1.
[10] *Labor Party,* 5.
[11] *Labor Party,* 14.
[12] *Labor Party,* 5-6.

The presence of special interests, "the third house at Washington," with their influence upon congressional committees, indirect taxation, creation of tariffs, enormous land grant monopolies, and a money system in the hands of a small group of favored bankers, these were the primary sins which he charged to the ledger of the government.

Torn between distrust of political action[13] and loyalty to the general plan of action approved by the National Labor Union, Heywood's review of proposed remedies resulted in a patchwork of anarchist economics and piecemeal expedients favored by union councils. He was in full sympathy with such issues as reduction in the hours of work, close coöperation between capital and labor in the production and distribution of wealth, direct taxation, low interest rates, and "honest money," all of which he conceded were worthy "animating principles" behind the formation of a political labor party.[14]

His declaration for free banking and a labor currency, a matter which he and the Worcester faction had considered independently, unaware of its other champions, indicated the direction in which their energies were to be henceforth expended:[15]

> Gold has served the plundering instincts of the stock exchange too well; it is too efficient a weapon . . . to be longer tolerated as the money of a free and enlightened people. . . . Let us have an American currency—perhaps a day's labor will be the unit of reckoning . . . but the least we can demand is that money shall represent the visible results of labor; that at least two dollars in real estate shall be pledged by mortgage for every paper dollar issued.

Misgivings as to the efficacy of political action soon assumed the proportions of complete rejection in the following year. A meeting in Boston in January, 1869, of a larger group of New England intellectuals allied to Heywood in sentiment resulted in the beginning of the New England Labor Reform League. This was a group of radicals which swung away from conventional activities in behalf of labor, prompted by the deterioration of the National Labor Union and the death of Sylvis. Within a short time, the policies of the League became wholeheartedly anarchistic, resulting in its moving to the extreme left and remaining there for its 25 years of existence. One of the important factors resulting in this move was the incorporation within its ranks of the services of William B. Greene. Greene was a former clergyman and Union officer, for many years known for his radical writings on the subjects of government and finance, and a personal friend of the French anarchist P. J. Proudhon.

---

[13] At one point he queried, "Universal suffrage is urged as a cure; but workingmen have voted in Massachusetts for two hundred years, and where are they now? . . . Right was before governments, and will survive them"; yet a short while later he proposed the following, "In order, therefore, to lay the axe at the root of the difficulty, we accept the opportune suggestion of the Labor Congress, at Chicago, and prepare for political action. The sooner we put good sense into the ballot box, the sooner good government will come out of it." *Labor Party,* 9, 13.

[14] *Labor Party,* 6, 9, 15, 17.

[15] *Labor Party,* 16. Heywood remarked at this time that "Wall Street is the next Richmond to be captured."

Spurred by the support of Greene, the native anarchist propaganda front swung into action in a determined fashion. Heywood moved to Princeton and established what became known as the Co-operative Publishing Company, the center of anti-statist publications for over a decade. He issued with the collaboration of Greene, the *Declaration of Sentiments* of the N. E. L. R. L. This brief document was written in an intense style, embracing the declarations of Greene and Warren, as well as his own, on anarchist political economy. As an indictment of the existing order of American society it has few equals in native radical literature of any shade. The partially-utopian tenor of the principal objective of the League, "abolition of class laws and false customs, whereby legitimate enterprise is defrauded by speculative monopoly, and the reconstruction of government on the basis of justice and reciprocity,"[16] shielded a number of far more specific condemnations of industrial, financial and governmental practices and policies destructive to the degree of freedom insisted upon by anarchism. In an economic sense, little was ever said thereafter which succeeded in making a significant addition to this pronunciamento:[17]

> Free contracts, free money, free markets, free transit, and free land—by discussion, petition, remonstrance, and the ballot, to establish these articles of faith as a common need, and a common right, we avail ourselves of the advantages of associate effort . . .

summed up the program of the League, and in distinctive language Heywood established the theoretical basis upon which these convictions were founded. Land, including all mineral, animal and vegetable categories as they existed in nature were declared to be held in common;[18] "property, as an original motive power, earns nothing," logically reducing the matter of price to labor cost, a stand in complete accord with Warren.[19] The phenomenon of poverty, widespread and increasing among the "laboring classes," was no inseparable concomitant of civilized society, doomed to be thus by some inscrutable force, but grew out of "the claim

---

16. See article 2 in Heywood (ed.), *Declaration of Sentiments and Constitution of the New England Labor Reform League*, 8.
17. *Declaration,* 6.
18. By this was meant common opportunity of occupation or acquisition for ownership and use through one's lifetime, and not communal exploitation in the sense of the socialist or communitarian belief. *Declaration,* 3.
19. This was in keeping with anarchist doctrines of early standing which denied the validity, in estimating price, of any element other than the relative amount of time spent in production.

to own and sell what one has not earned."[20] Thus developed the familiar system of doing business, which he condemned as "a species of piracy, wherein there is not only no intention to render equivalent for equivalent, but studied effort to get the largest possible amount of another's service or property, for the least possible return." He thus proscribed the business system as a "science of overreaching," which gradually served to absolve persons of any moral responsibility, fostered fraud, and promoted thereby the belief that honesty was an impossibility. The logical outcome was thought to be the embedding of the notion that poverty, crime, and war were perennial "necessary evils."

What were the devices by which a portion of society made a living without working? Heywood saw them as the well-intrenched and legally-sanctioned features of economics, — rent, profit and interest, when they represented neither "work done or risk incurred," and he demanded that they be abolished. To "make money otherwise than by earning it is the business of counterfeiters," was his scathing comment with relation to their ultimate results. The declaration did not explain how the League anarchists arrived at such conclusions. Payment of interest over and above the face value of a given debt was denounced, and full individual responsibility for all contracts entered into demanded. It re-asserted the demand that free banking be permitted, and that the monopoly of banking be destroyed, thus obviating necessity of the usury laws.[21]

The declaration closed with a statement of other aims of the N.E.L.R.L.: removal of tariffs; provision for free public markets in the centers of commerce where transactions might be carried on in much the manner of the Owenite Labor Exchanges,[22] with the use of labor note currency, and removal of the express, railroad and telegraphic lines from monopoly ownership so that their services might be furnished to patrons at cost. This was expected to occur as a consequence of free competition carried to its logical conclusion.

Heywood's first faltering and exploratory adventures in the material philosophy of native anarchism, with its emphasis on free competition and access to all raw materials and the exchange of goods on the basis of cost as nearly equated as possible with labor time spent in production, was followed by a flood of small paper-bound books from the Princeton press under his authorship. Featured by short, terse titles and reinforced with quotations from numerous authorities in the field of political economy, these booklets contributed a substantial boost to the intellectual propaganda of the movement which the League began to develop. Castigation of the government as the fountainhead of economic disorder grew in intensity thereafter, the Heywood writings furnishing the stimulus for the classic phrasing of the Tucker group a generation later. *Yours Or Mine,* published in 1869, and *Hard Cash,* five years later, contained the germ of his economic and political anti-statist thought. These were accompanied by an edition of Greene's *Mutual Banking* under the League's sponsorship in 1870, followed a short while later by the famous *Uncivil Liberty.* In this Heywood stated his unorthodox views on the woman's rights question, a matter to which he later devoted the major part of his energies.

---

[20] *Declaration,* 4.

[21] *Declaration,* 4-5.

[22] For the use of the labor note currency at the Irish economic experiment in coöperation at Ralahine, see Pare, *Co-öperative Agriculture,* 63-67.

Yours Or Mine attempted to solve the problem of property ownership. It was an investigation of the basis upon which property was held and the reasons why it was inequitably distributed. The labor reform movement should seek "fundamental equity," he said, and not become another "assault on vested interests," a "raid of the have-nothings upon the have-somethings."[23] The origins of property became lost in the origins of society itself, the source of derivation being obscure from the point of view of the political economist.[24] Heywood believed that occupancy and use were the real valid titles to ownership, despite the fact that society acquiesced in other claims to ownership in the belief that such deference performed some benefit to the 'general welfare." However, property built up as a result of the profit process he declared inadmissible to the discussion of equity, with the exception of "work done, or risk incurred." Profit-taking was an injustice which ranked second only to legalizing titles to absolute ownership of land or raw materials. The latter he denounced as "the most gigantic fraud ever perpetrated by human avarice," and "the first and most fruitful source of speculative accumulation."[25] Though sanctioned by religion, literature, and public opinion, he believed the status of both was located in and enforced by government,[26] but which made them none the less false. The resale of land he considered a kind of "stealing," when it involved profit as a result of "rise of values." Monopoly, and not "society" was responsible for the rise of land values, he asserted, a point which the anarchists stressed in their critique of Henry George in the pamphleteering of the 80's.

Concerning the item of rent, Heywood entered a rather novel argument. Property was an artificial creation, he said, and as such had no inherent power of increase. The owner of a house had no right to rent once the building had paid for itself, beyond the cost of the labor in transferring, insurance, and repair of natural deterioration. It was not fair to figure rent as a one way proposition. A house once paid for, when returned by the lessee after the period of occupation in original condition, not only was not subject to payment of rent, but was actually due a recompense. Heywood reasoned that if empty, natural decay would have occasioned the owner substantial repair costs with no revenue being received during this untenanted interim. A renter who returned property in its original condition was worthy of as much consideration as was the owner. This standard was equally applicable to all goods when loaned, he insisted, as all wealth was perishable to a greater or lesser degree.[27]

---

[23] Heywood, *Yours Or Mine; An Essay to Show the True Basis of Property and the Causes of Its Inequitable Distribution,* 3.

[24] Of the anarchists, Heywood was without doubt the most widely read in the works of the writers in the field of economics. His own productions indicated from time to time by quotations that he was familiar with Adam Smith, Ricardo, Ruskin, Hobbes, N. W. Senior, Bentham, Bastiat, J. S. Mill, De Quincey, Bouvier, Amasa Walker and Proudhon, as well as his individualist anarchist contemporaries, Greene, Spooner and Warren.

[25] *Yours Or Mine,* 13.

[26] "Since legal sanction makes stealing popular, respectable, and possible, the great anti-theft movement known as Labor Reform involves the abolition of the State." *Yours Or Mine,* 23.

If absolute ownership of land began the process of progressive inequality of wealth, the institution of an 'exclusive" currency as a cause was not far behind. Interest, like rent, was to Heywood nothing else than another tax on labor. It was made possible only by the ability of a few to control money:[28]

> Since money is the common measure of products, and exchanges must be made in the accepted currency, it is apparent that if speculation control this medium, dictating its nature, amount, and value, they are masters of both labor and trade, and can tax us on the chance to do business, and also for the privilege of living.

Heywood called legal tender "class currency," since it did not represent all the property in the nation, as he felt it should, but only the property of those who issued it.[29] It was useless to oppose high rates of interest, Heywood said, while defending low rates. All payment beyond labor and risk was no better than extortion. It was no more consistent to support some interest-taking than it was to hold that slavery was wrong in ten states but right and constitutional in two or three. "Interest must be adjudged crime in the court of conscience," he pronounced, "and the right to meddle with it carries with it the right to abolish it altogether. . . . Since all equitable exchange is simply exchange of services, interest, being the monopoly price of money, should be an outlaw in economical science."[30] Heywood applied the same reasoning

---

27. *Yours Or Mine,* 4-6, 8. Although this approach has generally been ignored or ridiculed by conventional economics, Henry George admitted that there was some worth to the contention that a recompense was due for such service rendered, rather than interest extracted. However, this was to him just one aspect of the phenomenon of interest, as "the reproductive forces of nature" was the real source of interest in its proper sense. George, *Progress and Poverty,* (15th ed.), 176, 188.
28. *Yours Or Mine,* 14. He accused the bankers, as did Greene, of manipulating the currency, buying when its value was deflated and selling when inflated, precipitating crises by conscious action.
29. *Yours Or Mine,* 14.
30. *Yours Or Mine,* 9. It was characteristic for Heywood, when writing on the matter of interest, to quote fragments from the Bible, usually Moses and Christ, as well as from such diverse personalities as Cato, St. Basil, Buxton and Roger Bacon, which inveighed against the taking of interest.

to the national debt. It was his contention that interest payments on the debt constituted an installment upon the principal, and that the debt was no longer valid once its face had been paid in interest. Carrying over such taxation as was represented by a national debt and imposing it upon succeeding generations was actually the maintenance of a system of involuntary servitude.[31]

By the time Heywood published *Hard Cash,* his acquaintance with radical literature included the violently anti-government pamphlets of Lysander Spooner as well as the economic treatises of Warren and Greene, his views reflecting the *No Treason*[32] series of the former to a marked degree. In many ways it was the most extreme of all native anarchist writings to come from the Princeton press.

Heywood's incursion into the field of relative values was made primarily as an assault upon the limited commodity basis of money and as a plea for the free currency of the mutual bank. Anything that had exchangeable value was money, and property had exchangeable value; hence all property was money, and governmental decrees were of no import in the face of this actuality. Gold and silver owed their use as a money to their value as property and not to any other supposed value. However, if two men chose to pay their debts in other "values," the actual bills used mattered little as long as they represented tangibles, regardless of the standard which was used to express them.[33]

"Capitalists object to trade unions of working people," he observed laconically, "but there is a trades-union of moneylenders of infinitely greater, more oppressive and fraudulent power, than any combination ever devised among working people."[34] He was under no misconceptions as to the influence of such ideas as his and those of the Labor Reform League among financiers, in spite of the vigor of the convictions expressed; ". . . despotism holds almost undisputed sway in finance, scoffing at dissent as puerility and patronizing equity as the whim of visionary reformers."[35] Heywood was sure that a national currency system was not the answer to the needs of commerce. The state as the sole issuer of money was a prospect that he did not entertain with any enthusiasm,[36] since he no longer considered the "government" as an abstraction, but as a group of very real men whom he saw silently acquiring control of this new and powerful financial arm. It was for this reason that he reproached the remnants of the National Labor Union[37] for its espousal of the national currency plan of Edward Kellogg. Other aspects of the activities of unionization, including the eight hour law campaign, he looked upon as "well-meant protests against existing abuses, and serviceable in their way," but he remained devoted to the idea of an industrial age of freedom under a system of "free land and free money."

---

[31] *Yours Or Mine,* 15.

[32] For a summary of these works, see Chapter VII, Part II.

[33] Heywood, *Hard Cash,* 6, 14, 18, 23.

[34] *Hard Cash,* 11. Concerning the matter of unions, he had stated the previous year; "Since the privilege of association is a fundamental necessity of free institutions, no one can disprove the right or duty of workers to form unions for their own protection; but they should not waste their strength in abortive expedients." *Yours Or Mine,* 18-19.

[35] *Hard Cash,* 14.

[36] ". . . a state currency, in a worse sense than a state church, a state school or a state newspaper press, is an imposition of the most fraudulent and oppressive nature . . . the attempt of government to issue currency on the imaginary basis of the "public faith" is a stately species of forgery, . . ." *Hard Cash,* 12-13.

The influence of Ezra Heywood's writings is hard to determine accurately. Despite the fact that some of his pamphlets sold from eighty to a hundred thousand copies, it is apparent from his style and vocabulary that his efforts were directed to a level of intelligence and comprehension far above average. His importance as a catalyst in radical circles in the 70's, however, cannot be wholly ignored. It was his tireless work as corresponding secretary that kept the New England Labor Reform League in existence. The League held bi-annual meetings, generally in Boston but once in a while in such Massachusetts cities as New Bedford and Framingham, for 24 years after the original gathering in January, 1869. It gradually became dominated by anarchist thought, but its activities continued to attract many elements of the labor and intellectual radical fronts, and maintained relations with Susan B. Anthony's National Woman's Suffrage Association and the National Labor Union for a few years. Prior to the 1872 election the N. E. L. R. L. broke with these organizations,[38] mainly through Heywood's insistence, but sympathy with individuals from diverse bodies quite distant from the anti-state partisans was evident in almost all its undertakings.[39] John Orvis, leader of the Sovereigns of Industry, became its president in 1873. Succeeding meetings were attended by such persons as Bronson Alcott, Lysander Spooner, Greene, and Charles T. Fowler.

Although taking little part in the formalities during the early years, Heywood was always present, and acquired a reputation for his many resolutions setting forth individualist doctrines. His speeches had some of their old abolitionist flavor, and the exuberant and sensational declarations they contained brought upon him the upbraiding of the daily press, especially in Boston. The *Post* characterized the speeches at the 1873 convention of May 25 and 26 as "levelling harangues," while the *Globe* considered their program one of "social incendiarism." The *Advertiser* described the League itself as "distemper of reform," and all condemned its program as encouraging the self-consciousness of the "workmen" and serving to set them apart as an "exclusive class."[40]

---

[37] *Hard Cash,* 21. On the decline of the National Labor Union, see Jonathan Grossman, *William Sylvis, Pioneer of American Labor* (New York, 1945), 267-268.

[38] The occasion for the breakup with the Anthony group was the backing by the suffragette organization of U. S. Grant, "that great criminal," as a presidential candidate. The rejection of a labor exchange plan in favor of coöperatives, which later Heywood spurned as "the life-boat of small thieves," provoked the split with the N. L. U. See *The Word,* I (September, 1872), 2.

[39] Heywood was the principal force behind a number of picturesque and intriguingly named organizations, among which were the American Anti-Usury Society, the Universal Peace Union, the American Spiritualist Association, the Boston Eight Hour League, the American Free Dress League, the New England Anti-Death Society (another spiritualist group), and the New England Free Love League, founded in the winter of 1873 with the help of Tucker and L. K. Joslin, for the principal purpose of getting Victoria Woodhull back to New England on another speaking tour.

Heywood himself was unaffected by adverse criticism, recalling to his listeners and readers that he had been previously labeled a fanatic and incendiarist while associated with Garrison. At the convention in New Bedford in the fall of 1873 he declared that labor reform was a part of the old struggle against chattel slavery. Speculation, rent, interest, and dividends had now taken the place of the lash as the means of depriving laborers of their rightful earnings. "The labor movement is not a struggle for a ten or an eight hour law, a theory of finance or cooperation merely, but an effort to make equity the ruling principle of business and politics."[41]

The N. E. L. R. L. began to attract the attention of non-New Englanders soon after its meetings received notice in the nation's press. The League was intended to be local in character but Heywood undertook to bring to its support all potential adherents. Plans for a New York convention of intellectuals were made which culminated in a three day gathering in May, 1871. The American Labor Reform League was launched at this meeting, and henceforth met annually in New York. It included many shades of native radical opinion, but was dominated by the New England anarchists until 1893. The A. L. R. L. was an eclectic gathering of non-political radicals, in many ways reflecting the confusion and indecision of similar independent groups in the face of a trend toward more centralization in all aspects of American life. The trend was one which advocates of various schemes of social simplification were well aware of, but which they were unable to exert influence upon in any appreciable manner.

The slate of officers elected at the 1872 convention indicates the degree of heterogeneity which the League meeting in New York encompassed. Greene, an anarchist, became president. The vice presidents were Orvis of the Sovereigns of Industry, the Fourierite socialist Albert Brisbane, and the feminist Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Heywood remained as the omnipresent corresponding secretary, while Stephen Pearl Andrews, Victoria Woodhull, and the old land reformers J. K. Ingalls, Lewis Masquerier and Henry Beeney all held honorary posts.[42] During the next few years a variety of other reform representatives became affiliated with the A. L. R. L. in one capacity or another. These included the Owenite socialist John Francis Bray, the labor leader A. W. St. John, and another representative of the Evans school of land reformers and former associate of Josiah Warren, William Rowe.[43]

---

[40] *The Word,* II (June, 1873), 1.

[41] *The Word,* II (December, 1873), 2.

[42] *The Word,* I (June, 1872), 1.

The cross-current of opinion stirred up in the meetings of the N. E. L. R. L. and wide correspondence in response to his libertarian pamphlets brought Heywood into action on a third and eventually much more widely known aspect of anarchist propaganda. This was as editor of a periodical devoted to spreading the ideas of the men with whom he became associated as a result of his other interests. In May, 1872, Heywood issued the first number of *The Word,* a four page monthly sheet, bearing the subtitle "A Monthly Journal of Reform." It was intended to be an organ in which views of the members of the two Reform Leagues could be expressed, regardless of whether or not they adhered to Heywood's economic and social philosophy. He listed as contributors, William B. Greene, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Josiah Warren, John Orvis, Victoria Woodhull, Albert Brisbane, John Humphrey Noyes, Stephen Pearl Andrews, William Denton, Frederick William Evans, Wendell Phillips, and Henry Ward Beecher. The policy of the paper was summed up in this prospectus:[44]

> THE WORD favors the abolition of speculative income, of woman's slavery, and war government; regards all claims to property not founded on a labor title as morally void, and asserts the free use of land to be the inalienable privilege of every human being—on having the right to own or sell only his service impressed upon it. Not by restrictive methods, but through freedom and reciprocity, THE WORD seeks the extinction of interest, rent, dividends, and profit, except as the represent work done; the abolition of railway, telegraphic, banking, trades-union and other corporations charging more than actual cost for values furnished, and the repudiation of all so-called debts the principal whereof has been paid in the form of interest.

Heywood's paper failed to keep the celebrities listed above as steady contributors. It soon gained a reputation as a radical sheet, however, and enjoyed wide circulation, with subscribers in every state in the Union, Europe and even in South Africa.[45] Each issue carried an impressive list of letters to the editor on a wide variety of subjects occasioned by discussion in previous issues. A separate department of the paper, bearing the heading "The Opposition," carried full comments of Heywood's critics in the daily press. This was an unusual policy, in view of the marked sensitivity of the radical movement as a whole to adverse criticism. The labor policies of the Reform Leagues tended to stress more and more the uncompromising economic views of their anarchist members, while *The Word* began to assume the appearance of a personal organ for the expression of the Heywood stand on all matters pertinent to the radical movement. Despite this trend there continued to be much controversial material in the paper, and many of Heywood's personal friends and fellow anarchists used its pages to bitterly oppose his stands on some things.

---

[43] *The Word,* III (May, 1874), 2; *The Word,* IV (May, 1875), 2.

[44] *The Word,* I (May, 1872), 1. The four page broadsheet sold for five cents a copy; an annual subscription cost 50 cents.

[45] *The Word,* V (April, 1877), 2. In this issue Heywood claimed to have been the first to suggest the term "labor reform."

In the first issue of the paper, Heywood warmly approved the declarations of the International Workingmen's Association at its gatherings in Belgium and Switzerland, especially those which called upon the members everywhere to "obliterate" nationalism and "abolish" patriotism, which he called "the most barbarous and stupid of virtues." He sounded one note of disapproval, however, reflecting the bitter dispute which had already split the anarchist and socialist factions in Europe: "It is not pleasant to see Dr. Marx and other leaders of this great and growing fraternity lean so strongly toward compulsory policies. If the International would succeed it must be true to its bottom idea—voluntary association in behalf of our common humanity."[46]

The following month the stamp of approval was placed upon a measure in direct opposition to anarchist principles. This was the proposal of John H. Keyser for a graduated income and estate tax ranging from one-half of one per cent on incomes of $5000, to 50% on everything above $5 million.[47] He followed this with an attack upon philanthropy, in which he questioned the basis of all large fortunes and the apparent magnanimity of their possessors:[48]

> Where did the George Peabodys, the Peter Coopers, and others of the alms-giving class of philanthropists get the money which they presume to "give" away as their own? . . . The "poor" whom these philanthropists become so conspicuously distinguished by befriending are really the creators of the wealth they humbly receive as a gift; and, if equity prevailed, their now acknowledged "benefactors" might themselves be subjects of "charity." To alleviate suffering is praiseworthy, but to assist in creating in manifold forms the misery one gets credit for assuaging is a "deed" which . . . cannot be approved of.

His stand on the land question, which already was under fire from his erstwhile teachers, Warren and Greene, found a companion ground of disagreement through his insertion in *The Word* of the ultra-feminist point of view on behalf of Victoria Woodhull and her protagonists, which included her sister Tennie Claflin. The core of their propaganda was a frontal attack on the institution of marriage as one lacking justice and equality. Heywood himself entered this violent controversy on the side of the femininists, his pamphlet *Uncivil Liberty* containing a number of explanations of the "woman movement." He also endorsed woman suffrage,[49] at a time when fellow opponents of government were already declaring the futility of voting.

---

[46] *The Word,* I (May, 1872), 3.

[47] *The Word,* I (June, 1872), 2. Keyser, an associate of Thomas Devyr and other leaders of the land reform movement, had been at one time secretary of the New York Land Reform Association. *The Spirit of the Age,* I (December 29, 1849), 410.

[48] *The Word,* II (August, 1873), 2.

Warren, in retirement but an occasional contributor to both *The Word* and *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly,* was a resident at Heywood's home for a time, even though he disagreed with him on most every other issue besides the basis of land ownership. These included the attack on possessors of large fortunes, the graduated tax proposal, and the abuse of the eight hour day agitation and the Massachusetts Labor Union.[50] Embarrassed by the policies which Heywood and Mrs. Woodhull, as well as the N. E. L. R. L., proclaimed, the aging progenitor of anarchism in America gave vent to expressions of unmistakable dissatisfaction before breaking formal relations with all and retiring to Charlestown, Mass., to the home of Edward Linton.[51]

Although a severe critic, Warren was not an exponent of the conspiracy theory of society, which Heywood now was inclined to support. He upbraided Heywood for what he styled "hasty and injudicious" language and impatience with those who did not understand the principles of equity and put them into complete practice at once. The language used in *The Word* was apt to repel many potential friends, he cautioned, although he hoped that new readers would understand the use of the terms as employed by the editor.[52] In like manner he opposed the uncompromising war upon state marriages; not only were there many persons who preferred being married thus, but there existed the potential misinterpretation by the popular press, a matter which was of great concern to Warren by this time.[53] Referring to the land question, Warren doubted the need for the assault upon legal land titles. He continued to stand by the earlier position that land speculation would cease if all land were sold at the price paid by the original buyer in all subsequent transactions involving the same piece of land.[54] Warren, however, proposed no tactics which might be utilized in effecting such a reform, whereas Heywood suggested a combination of "squatter sovereignty" and passive resistance, the latter of these two being used with great effectivensss by the Irish Land League against absentee English landlords at a later time.

---

[49] Heywood, *Uncivil Liberty: An Essay to Show the Injustice and Impolicy of Ruling Woman Without Her Consent,* 4-7, 9-10, 20; *The Word,* I (August, 1872), 2.

[50] Warren was a supporter of both the Massachusetts Labor Union and the eight hour movement, and broke with the New England Labor Reform League after it adopted Heywood's resolutions at the 1872 convention opposing both. *The Word,* I (August, 1872), 1; *The Word,* I (September, 1872), 1, 3.

[51] Warren was already in Boston, engaged in writing a series of articles for the *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* in 1873, on his experiences with Robert Owen. Under the title "Communism: the Way It Worked and What It Led to," several had already appeared when the Beecher-Tilton case became a national scandal via Mrs. Woodhull's paper, and provoked Warren's rebuke for mixing the labor reform and marriage questions.

[52] *The Word,* I (April, 1873), 2; Warren, *Letter to E. H. Heywood,* 2. See also Heywood's communications to *The Index,* V, 153; VII, 536.

[53] Warren, *Letter to Heywood,* 3-4; *The Word,* I (June, 1872), 3; *The Word,* II (July, 1873), 4.

Warren feared wealth, and felt that an effort to secure a graduated income tax would be defeated through the efforts of capital, as well as possibly resulting in a considerable degree of violence. Even if it were placed in operation, he doubted that the officials in charge of raising and utilizing the funds designated would escape immersion in wholesale graft.[55] At the same time, he warned against stressing class distinctions in reference to possessors of wealth, or "the successful in the general scramble," as he chose to designate the rich. He felt that ignorance was more responsible for misery than was purposeful design on the part of a scheming minority; he saw all becoming oppressors in turn. In the absence of a system of "equitable compensation," a man might be living on the "profits" made from his particular business, and at the same time be receiving as little as a tenth of what actually belonged to him in equity. Hence to denounce all profit-takers as "thieves and robbers," as was occasionally the case at the Labor Reform League meetings, was erroneous and unfair.[56]

Censure by both Warren and Greene[57] had little effect upon the course of Heywood's conduct of *The Word* or his participation in the Reform Leagues. His admiration for their writings was equalled only by his indifference to their criticisms as he continued an energetic campaign of writing and speaking on an independent basis. Having expressed himself in a number of ways which even his preceptors considered extreme, he was to continue expounding the economic and social principles he had obtained from them, enlarging the scope of his attentions month by month to include or reject such fragments of the radical movement as he chose with which to align himself. In July, 1874 he formally broke with *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* as a result of attacks on *The Word* and the N. E. L. R. L. stand on interest, banking, individual sovereignty and majority rule.[58] In succeeding years he severely criticized Orvis, Brisbane, and the whole structure of Fourierite[59] socialism. He singled out for particular disparagement the National Labor Union, Edward Kellogg, and the Greenback movement,[60] which he conceived as serving at best to clear the way for a system of free banking. He was convinced now that the major task of "labor reform" was the abolition of property in land[61] and not the creation of a free money structure, thus taking sides in a controversy over which radicals haggled for the next three decades.

---

[54] Warren, *Letter to Heywood,* 2; *The Word,* II (May, 1873), 2.

[55] *The Word,* I (July, 1872), 3.

[56] Warren, *Letter to Heywood,* 1-2.

[57] Greene as well as Warren was not pleased over the attention being given to the campaign for sexual freedom in Heywood's paper. In a communication to Heywood he spoke of it as "this free-love muddle." *The Word,* III (August, 1874), 4.

[58] *The Word,* III (July, 1874), 2.

[59] "Fourier's complete surrender of labor to speculative capital forbids me to

Heywood was characteristically impatient with and abusive of the restraint of liberal reform. His treatment of Washington Gladden's *Working People and Their Employers* is an excellent illustration. Although believing that it might be read with profit, he thought press reviews had been far more complimentary than the book deserved and that Gladden had presented no adequate solution of the difficulty at hand. He was incensed because he believed Gladden had misrepresented the radicals and had intimated that no portion of the radical reform group felt friendly to a peaceful settlement of the labor question. In addition, he considered Gladden's favorable quotation of Herbert Spencer, who misunderstood the stand of Proudhon with respect to present holders of wealth, indicated to the average reader that the anarchists advocated forcible dispossession, a matter concerning which the anarchists felt particularly sensitive.[62]

The outbreak of the railroad strikes in the summer of 1877 brought an immediate response from Heywood. He followed a series of editorials with a booklet, *The Great Strike*, which furnished an opportunity for a summary of anarchist economics as interpreted by the Labor Reform group, as well as for a statement from the anti-government wing on the separate items of striking, violence, and the attitude toward the state and capital in times of industrial disputes. Heywood was convinced that the execution of the "Molly Maguires," just a month before the first of the strikes occurred, was of utmost significance. He insisted that their arrest, trial and conviction had been based on evidence which no court in the land would have taken against any man of wealth or social prominence. He believed that the whole case had been "worked up" against the Mollies by the Pinkerton Detective Agency at the express order of the railroad interests with a deliberate intention of removing them permanently;[63] ". . . These eleven manual laborers . . . were put out of life

---

even hope that he can safely be taken as a guide in social reform." *The Word,* V (September, 1876), 3.

[60] *The Word,* IV (March, 1876), 2; *The Word,* VI (June, 1877), 2.

[61] *The Word,* VII (December, 1878), 2.

[62] The Proudhonian apothegm "Property is robbery" Spencer interpreted literally, ignoring the former's definition of "property." Gladden accepted Spencer's interpretation that anarchism meant to right material wrongs by violence. *The Word,* V (November, 1876), 2; Washington Gladden, *Working People and Their Employers* (Boston, 1876), 199-200.

[63] Heywood, *The Great Strike: Its Relations to Labor, Property and Government,* 15. Heywood was nearer the truth than most of the conservatives. For examples of irregularities in the conduct of the trial and evidence of

with a ferocity which shocked the civilized world." The ensuing strike was partially in the nature of a reaction to this initial act of violence. This oversimplification of the cause of a complex, nation-wide affair served to highlight Heywood's hate of the railroad companies and their collaboration with the government.[64]

Heywood recognized the Pittsburgh strikers as "morally lawful belligerents" engaging in "defensive warfare," even though he disagreed with them diametrically in philosophy:[65]

> The different sections of the Labor Reform movement with which I have the honor to serve do not think the destruction of life or property a judicious method of advancing any reform. We reject the philosophy of strikes, oppose trades-union monopolies of labor, and discard every other style of associative or legislative intrusion to settle this question. Personally a non-resistant, I would not take another's life to save my own. Asking no favors for labor but that it be left alone, I seek to abolish capital—. . . by unrestricted enterprise, by peaceful methods of evolution . . .

He deplored the use of coercion by the government and the employers to put down the strike as "ill-advised and abortive."[66] Such a course of conduct in the future with the intention of obtaining obedience or agreement he believed would be a total failure and would result in less harmony than had existed before. This eruption was but the beginning of a long contest, which no amount of violence would abate. The only conditions which would produce tranquility once more would be the total abolition of property in land and raw materials, and the removal of all restrictions on exchange, the "free land and free money" program.[67]

On November 3, 1877, Heywood was arrested while speaking in Boston by Anthony Comstock, and charged with the violation of postal statutes relative to the circulation of obscene material through the mails. This was the first of three prosecutions of Heywood by the federal government on such charges, on two of which he was convicted and served terms in prison. The subtle degrees by which *The Word* had been transformed from a labor reform to a "love reform" paper cannot be detailed,

---

possible coaching of witnesses by James McParlan, Pinkerton detective hired by President Franklin Gowen of the Reading Railroad, see James W. Coleman, *The Molly Maguire Riots* (Richmond, 1936), 162, 168-172.

[64] See *The Great Strike,* 6, 8-9, for indictments of the federal government as having permitted the railroads to grow in strength at the expense of the remainder of the nation.

[65] *The Great Strike,* 13.

[66] The refusal of militia to obey orders at various times during the strike, especially commands to fire on strikers, Heywood found especially heartening. *The Great Strike,* 20.

[67] *The Great Strike,* 3-4, 22-23. Heywood was now of the belief that the dispute between "capital and labor" was "an irrespressible conflict," a stand inconsistent with an estimation which he had expressed less than ten years before.

even though there had been a growing body of members of Heywood's subscribers to whom the matter of female independence before the law was of paramount importance. Once he took up the fight for the extension of women's rights with the primary intention of removing women from economic subjection, he found himself drawn more and more into the display of material of somewhat intimate nature which clashed vioelntly with the morality attitudes reflected in the Comstock laws. The unusual approach of several of his women correspondents, including his own wife, the former Angela Tilton, a radical in her own right, soon brought the paper unusual notoriety. His arrest was merely a matter of time, in the minds even of his friends.

Heywood was sentenced to two years at hard labor on June 25, 1878,[68] an event which stirred up many elements of liberal and radical thought throughout the East. A mass meeting of 6000 people, timed to coincide with the anniversary of the emancipation of the West Indies slaves, culminated with a demonstration in Faneuil Hall in Boston on August 1, demanding Heywood's release and the repeal of the Comstock laws. Presided over by the old abolitionist, Elizur Wright, the speakers included J. H. W. Toohey, president of the National Defense Society, the principal opponent of the Comstock-dominated Society for the Suppression of Vice. Other prominent participants were Laura Kendrick, J. M. L. Babcock, Moses Hull and Thaddeus B. Wakeman, the latter the author of a petition for the repeal of the Comstock laws which obtained 70,000 signatures.[69] Heywood was released from prison the following December 19, and pardoned by President Hayes the next day, political influence supplementing the storm of protest emanating from free thought and liberal circles.[70]

Arrested a second time in the fall of 1882, Heywood was acquitted in Boston before a federal court on April 12, 1883, in a trial where Heywood appeared in his own defense, delivering a speech which lasted four and a half hours. Finally declared not guilty by the jury, the verdict was received with obvious pleasure by a considerable gathering of sympathetic onlookers.[71]

---

[68] Tucker (ed.), *Proceedings of the Indignation Meeting . . . August 1, 1878 . . .*, 3-4.

[69] Tucker (ed.), *Proceedings of the Indignation Meeting . . . August 1, 1878 . . .*, 6-9, 12-13, 20, 28-29, 46-48.

[70] Carl Schurz and James A. Garfield were both contacted by the defense, and favored Heywood's release. See Ezra Heywood to Elizabeth M. F. Denton, August 17, and December 14, 1878; Angela Heywood to Elizabeth M. F. Denton, December 20, 1878, in Heywood MSS., Labadie Collection.

[71] See the short summary in Broun and Leech, *Anthony Comstock,* 183-184. For the full text of Heywood's speech see *Free Speech: Report of Ezra H. Heywood's Defense Before the United States Court in Boston, April 10-11 and 12, 1883; Together with Judge Nelson's Charge to the Jury . . .*, 9-43. This interesting booklet, prepared by Heywood for public distribution, contains the verbatim testimony of key witnesses, as well as numerous reprints of press comments which the widely discussed trial provoked.

Conviction for such publishing activities as these confirmed Heywood in his decision to continue printing the literature of the free love element, and in 1879 he changed the policy of *The Word* to conform with his advanced views of the marital and sexual question. Anti-statist views also continued to find extended expression,[72] but, like Stephen Pearl Andrews, he became engrossed with the possibilities of a union of all the various fragments of the intellectual radical movement. With the aid of Andrews, he attempted to bring these together in a Union Reform League, with headquarters in Princeton, but at the end of three years, the major part of the interest in such a project had waned. The '80's saw the initiative in the spreading of anarchism pass into the hands of Benjamin Tucker and his associates, who for a time confined their attentions to predominantly economic questions.

For a brief period, in 1889, Heywood re-entered the arena, stimulated by the widespread campaign for local option on the part of temperance groups in Massachusetts, following the passage of a local option law in Ohio in 1888.[73] The drive for the prohibition of the sale and traffic of liquor by law, accompanied by a parallel proposition to control the sale of alcoholic beverages by state license, provoked the appearance of the vigorous counter-attack *Social Ethics,* wherein Heywood arraigned the crusade to legislate the virtue of temperance.

He protested that whether an individual partook of alcohol or abstained was strictly an affair of his own. Philosophically, morally, or politically, the drive to promote sobriety was baseless, in the eyes of the believer in natural society, where personal freedom was unrestrained except when it approached the area where it infringed on the similarity of freedom possessed by another.[74] Blanket statutory prohibition constituted a serious invasion of individual personality; and, said Heywood, "individuals are the primary and ultimate facts in this wilderness of pronoun which is called society."[75] Total prohibition or state-licensed sale were sides of the same coin; one despaired of liberty and the other of temperance, "two distrusts of the ability of men and women to work out their own salvation."[76]

Prohibition he considered irrational sumptuary legislation which contributed nothing to bridging the moral gap, while licensing in the hope of producing temperance by destroying the "grog shop" approached the problem from the reverse side of truth, since the habit of intemperance preceded the dispensary, and not vice versa.[77] The drive to license the sale in salutary surroundings was "a raid on the poor man's hotel," the saloon, and highly suspicious:[78]

---

[72] In April 1881, Heywood said that *The Word*'s whole stand could be summed up as the support of "abolition of property in raw materials and the removal of restrictions on association and exchange." *The Word,* X (May, 1881), 2.

[73] Peter Odegard, *Pressure Politics, the Story of the Anti-Saloon League* (New York, 1928), 2-3.

[74] Heywood, *Social Ethics: An Essay to Show that Since the Right of Private Judgment Must be Respected in Morals as Well as in Religion, Free Rum, the Conceded Right of Choice in Beverages and Required Power to Decline Intoxicants Promotes Rational Sobriety and Assures Temperance,* 23.

[75] *Social Ethics,* 6.

[76] *Social Ethics,* 3-4.

> . . . the hypocritical manifesto of the politico-ecclesiastical rogues trying to sail between rum and water into office. If it is right to sell rum at all, it is the right of poor men and women to sell it. License is wrong because . . . civil power ought not to sanction evil manifest in ill-use of liquor; . . . because it accepts intemperance as a fixed permanent fact, instead of working to abolish it; . . . because it enacts monopoly . . . and enshrines vicious practices in attractive, respectable, insidious environment.

When Heywood was convicted for postal law violations in 1878, he had suspected that others than his publishing business had precipitated his difficulties, especially his attitudes toward labor and government. When he was again arrested on similar charges, in May, 1890,[79] he was convinced that it was a political matter. The new Harrison administration had replaced the Democratic postmaster in Princeton with an enemy of Heywood's, Josiah D. Gregory, whom the former referred to as a "high-toned, prohibitory, anti-saloon Republican,"[80] a man unsympathetic with any radical sentiment. At his direction, deliveries of *The Word* had been interrupted.

Heywood was sentenced again to two years in prison in Charlestown, serving the full term. Several petitions to Harrison for pardon were ignored, largely because of malice on the part of his own relatives, Heywood charged.[81] One of these petitions, signed by 1400 prominent persons in the United States, England and Scotland, including Elizabeth B. Chase, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Annie Besant, Andrew Jackson Davis, Theoder Dwight Weld, the pioneer abolitionist, and several other well-known persons, indicated the interest the case aroused.[82] Efforts to have his paper printed in his absence failed, and for the first time in 18 years, the first sustained voice of anarchist doctrine in America was silenced. Resumed in 1892 upon its editor's return, it permanently lapsed when he died May 22, 1893, little over a year after returning.

---

[77] It was Heywood's belief that hard drinking and general alcoholic intemperance were habits of the wealthy which the less-favored later adopted. *Social Ethics,* 11.

[78] *Social Ethics,* 9.

[79] Boston *Herald,* May 12, 1890.

[80] In a letter to *The Truth Seeker,* May 10, 1890, Heywood mentioned this matter, while remarking that from 1877 to 1884 "the church bigots kept me and my family oscillating between prison and the poor house." For the influence of Republicans in producing anti-Republican sentiment among freethinkers as a result of the prosecutions following sales of Heywood's *Cupid's Yokes,* see Sidney Warren, *American Freethought, 1860-1914* (Columbia University *Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law,* No. 504) (New York, 1943), 196-197.

[81] Ezra Heywood to Elizabeth M. F. Denton, April 18, 1892. See also the letter written in jail by Heywood which explained part of this stand in *The Free Thinkers' Magazine,* X (March, 1892), 180-181.

[82] National Defense Association, *United States vs. Heywood. Why the Defendant Should Be Released,* 1, 17-18, 20-21.

Ezra Heywood is best remembered for his efforts in the propagation of native anti-government thought and literature[83] during a period of transition when radicalism was receding almost to the vanishing point before a wave of post-war sentiment for continued conformity. Although not particularly important as an original thinker, his services as a publisher in reprinting the works of Warren and Greene served to keep their ideas current, resulting in the widespread interest in the economics of the free society on the part of a later generation. His own erratic writings were not without influence; some of his floridity, acrid phrasing and talent for articulation was to be found in the work of Tucker at a later time. The revival of the mutual money theories of Greene is particularly noteworthy from the standpoint of anarchist economic thought, in this respect Heywood's work being an important rediscovery.

2. *William B. Greene, Money Reformer*

The fundamental structure of American anarchism is without doubt based upon the social and economic experiments and writings of Josiah Warren. In one respect however, his subsequent followers chose to expand the limits of the outline of the free economy. This was in a field in which the New Harmony pioneer had been noticeably inconclusive, finance. The gradual but increasing complexity of the economy, especially the division of labor occurring in both production and distribution, brought the matter of exchange more forcibly to the attention of the anti-statist radicals. This resulted in one of the few real additions to Warrenite mutualism, the idea of the mutual bank of William B. Greene, an ignored contemporary of Warren's during the period of the experimental towns.

Greene, unlike Warren, did not devote a lifetime to unorthodox activities. His life touched the radical movement with intensity only at intervals, and his conversion to full-fledged anarchist beliefs occupied only the last ten years of his life, despite an intimate acquaintanceship of a full three decades. Furthermore, his early years give no clue as to the source of any of his later interest in political economy and finance. In a similar manner to Ezra Heywood, it was a sequel to an abortive career in the ministry.

Born in Haverhill, Massachusetts,[84] the son of a Boston newspaper publisher, Greene was educated at West Point, and acquired there an affinity with military ways that he never repudiated, despite his early defection. He took part in the Seminole campaign in Florida against Osceola as a young officer, and while on active duty professed to have gone through a sudden conversion to religion, now believing war to be "unjust." He continued to hold his commission and remain in the fighting area, however, hesitant to expose himself to expected ridicule on announcing his change of heart.[85] He returned north following a serious illness after eighteen months of service and entered a theological seminary. Becoming an Unitarian, he now devoted much of his time to the study of Egyptian and Indian history and religion, some of his later writings indicating a competent grasp of oriental philosophy.[86] After leaving the Harvard Divinity School, where he had become an associate of Thomas Wentworth Higginson,[87] he located in Brookfield, near Worcester, and engaged in the writing of religious tracts and pamphlets.

---

[83] See also article in *Lucifer,* VIII (November 7, 1890), 3, for an evaluation of Heywood as a pioneer in the propagation of rational sex education among children.

[84] His father was Nathaniel Greene, founder of the Boston *Statesman. The Word,* VII (July, 1878), 2. Short biographical sketches can be found in

Few instances in American history have created as much curiosity concerning economic and financial matters among amateurs and members of the general citizenry as the panic of 1837, and the drastic credit stringency which characterized it. Banking abuses came under concentrated scrutiny and gave rise to many proposed radical remedies. William Beck's plan for inducing the business world to adopt credit and employ it so as to perform the functions of money by utilizing a complicated system which generalized credit in account, was broached in 1839, and was one of the first. Edward Kellogg's *Labor and Other Capital,* a direct outgrowth of his personal experiences in the panic, had been completed by July, 1843, although it remained unpublished for several years and did not receive much attention until post-Civil War times.[88] Other plans, involving considerable originality and inspired by a fear of the potentialities of a money system based on an alliance between large bankers and politicians, sought to impress the independent-minded with the possibilities of solution on a local level, by-passing reforms requiring large-scale adoption.

Financial thinking was still dominated by concepts which dated from

---

James Grant Wilson and John Fiske, (eds.), *Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography,* II, 754, and *The National Cyclopedia of American Biography,* VII, 526.

[85] Greene, *The Incarnation. A Letter to Rev. John Fiske, D. D.,* 27-29, 30-34.

[86] *Liberty,* IX (December 24, 1892), 1. See also the following works by Greene; *Remarks in Refutation of the Treatise of Jonathan Edwards* (West Brookfield, Mass., 1848); *Transcendentalism* (Boston, 1871); *The Blazing Star* (Boston, 1872).

[87] Higginson remembered him as being "strikingly handsome and mercilessly opinionated." Higginson, *Cheerful Yesterdays,* 106-107. Another reminiscence by Higginson on Greene and his background in the Boston magazine *Brains* was reprinted in *Liberty,* VIII (January 16, 1892), 3.

[88] Kellogg, *Labor and Other Capital,* (1833 ed.), preface, xv. For the latter period see Chester MacA. Destler, *The Influence of Edward Kellogg Upon American Radicalism, 1865-1896* (Chicago, 1932).

early eighteenth century times, and concerned the needs of a decentralized economic society. A product of the colonial land bank period, the philosophy centered on a banking system based on private credit. This situation may have been aided by the comparative lack of a commercial class in the vast non-urban areas, the group most interested in central banking policies along European models.[89]

The drive for centralized banking on mercantile credit, well under way by the 1837 panic, was meeting plenty of opposition during the same period, since it hardly coincided with majority opinion well down to the Civil War. Many expert critics, among them Richard Hildreth, William M. Gouge and George Tucker, had promoted the idea of competition in banking, attacked the national bank and condemned state chartered banks in general.[90]

Free banking in the sense in which it was understood during this period was not synonymous with the unchartered system proposed by early individualist anarchists. Despite many structural similarities and often a similar propaganda the two financial theories proceeded along separate ways. It can readily be seen, however, that the monetary theories of Greene and Lysander Spooner are deeply indebted to the environment of unrest caused by disturbed relations existing in the money system of the United States of their times.

The writings of Greene were to become the best known, although Spooner had previously stated the position of the free money decentralist in Greene's home area with the publication of his *Constitutional Law Relative to Credit, Currency and Banking* in Worcester in 1843. Spooner had followed this up with an even more positive work in this line, *Poverty, Its Illegal Causes and Legal Cure,* which appeared in Boston three years later.[91] It is doubtful whether Greene had any knowledge of these brief treatises when his own expositions of the philosophy of mutualism in banking began to appear for the first time, in a series of newspaper articles in the Worcester *Palladium* in 1849 under the pseudonym "Omega." Gathered together and expanded with unpublished material, the collection was issued, under the title *Equality,* in West Brookfield that same year. This is essentially the same work brought out under the title *Mutual Banking* the following year, and was destined to become the most widely reprinted of all anarchist financial publications written by a native American. For an understanding of Greene's political, economic and social ideas they are best studied together.

---

[89] Fritz Redlich, "Mercantilist Thought and Early American Banking," in *Essays in American Economic History: Eric Bollman and Studies in Banking* (New York, 1944), 107-130; Bray Hammond, "Historical Introduction," in Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, *Banking Studies* (Washington, 1941), 5-36.

[90] See especially Richard Hildreth, *The History of Banks: To Which Is Added, A Demonstration of the Advantages and Necessity of Free Competition in the Business of Banking* (Boston, 1837), 131-142; William M. Gouge, *A Short History of Paper Money and Banking in the United States* (Philadelphia, 1833); George Tucker, *Theory of Money and Banks Investigated* (Boston, 1839). For a full treatment of this matter consult Harry E. Miller, *Banking Theories in the United States Before 1860* (Cambridge, Mass., 1927); Michael J. L. O'Connor, *Origins of Academic Economics in the United States* (New York, 1944).

[91] A summary of these financial treatises can be found in Chapter VII, Part I.

A bank, in Greene's opinion, had only one reason for existing: that of being a place to bring together borrowers and lenders, regardless of what the particular capital available for lending consisted and what was wanted by the borrower. The man without tools and raw material was helpless despite any degree of industry, while the owner of such things faced the prospect of watching them deteriorate in the event that laborers desiring them for productive purposes could not be found. Being what he called "mutually necessary" to each other, their efforts to locate each other was a continual process, which banks could greatly facilitate.[92] The bank as he saw it, however, was an anti-social institution, carrying on a war with those citizens who did not happen to be a part of it. Free competition among owners of capital he regarded a healthful thing, depressing the rate of interest and guaranteeing to the worker a greater percentage return of the total of his production. Once a bank in the ordinary sense of the word became organized, this process abruptly ceased. The device thus conceived enabled a number of lenders to escape the consequences of competition, and enabled them to bring "crushing" force upon individuals who did not belong to their number, thus resulting in their possessing the power to control interest rates to their best advantage and prevent the fall of the price of any commodity which they offered to potential lenders.[93] Chartered by the legislature, they were now in a perfect position "to enable the few to bring the many under tribute"; "On the side of the bank there is a small army, well equipped, well officered, and well disciplined; on the side of the community, there is a large, undisciplined crowd, without arms, and without leaders."[94]

The picture was complete only as far as the particular group of capitalists forming the bank in question was considered; there still existed the possibility of competition from without, with the consequent much-feared drop in the rate of interest. Here the hand of government, which granted them the monopoly of incorporation, stepped in again to preclude the latter possibility with another special privilege.[95] But to understand this stage, Greene declared, it was necessary to review the postion of the government in the general matters of the currency and artificially-created rates of interest.

---

[92] Greene, *Equality*, 3.

[93] Commented Greene: "If operatives combine with each other, because they find competition bears too strongly upon them, and strike for higher wages, they may render themselves legally liable to severe punishment; but if capitalists combine to prevent a fall in the price of the commodity they have to offer in the market, the legislature applauds their action, and grants them a charter to enable them to accomplish their purpose more easily and effectually." *Equality*, 4.

[94] *Equality*, 12.

[95] *Equality*, 7-8.

Greene believed that all trade was barter in one form or another. The adoption of specie by society as a circulating medium merely made the process easier rather than destroyed it. It still remained a valuable commodity, subject to purchase and sale like all others; ". . . when we sell anything for money, we *buy* the money, and . . . when we buy anything with money, we *sell* the money."[96]

With the establishment of specie in the form of gold and silver as the only legal tender by the government and the exclusion of all other types of property from furnishing this function, an altogether new element entered into consideration. Exchange remained the same type of process, but the action of the legislature had enhanced the utility of the precious metals in a "remarkable manner." The exchangeable value of a particular commodity depended upon not only its utility but the relative scarcity of it as well. The relative scarcity of gold and silver gave them now a new value not inherent in them as metals, but an artificial one conferred on them by the action of the government, presumably in the interests of society.[97] The result? Greene said that now the metals became a marketable commodity as a *medium of exchange,* and their utility as a means of exchange became abruptly contracted, allowing those who managed to obtain a monopoly of the supply of these metals to similarly control the business of the area using them as the sole legal tender, and thereby secure a premium for their use by all others engaging in commerce.[98] "Hence follow great social and political evils," commented Greene. One of the major attempts to repair the damage done to the commercial structure was the passage by the government of laws arbitrarily limiting the rate of interest. This did nothing to restore any kind of competition among loaners of capital, however, because of still another government-created factor, the allowing of holders of specie, incorporated as banks, to issue paper money up to twice the face value of the specie.[99] This enable them to gether twice the rate of interest permitted, or to drive all non-banker loaners of capital out by charging one-half the interest until the latter ceased competing. Thus even "usury" laws[100] were negated by the creation of banks. The process now went along relatively unhindered, Greene observed:[101]

---

[96] *Equality,* 33-34.

[97] "By adopting the precious metals as the legal tender in the payment of debts, society confers a new value upon them, by the action of society. . . . This new value has no natural measure, because it is not a natural but a social value." *Equality,* 35-36.

[98] "The monopolizers of the precious metals have an undue power over the community; they can say whether money shall or shall not be permitted to exercise its legitimate functions. . . . The great natural difficulty which originally stood in the way of exchange is now the private property of a class; and this class cultivates this difficulty and makes money out of it." *Equality,* 37-38.

[99] Greene was vague as to the credit operations of the banks of his time; banks of a century after his observations, under the Federal Reserve System, are known to lend as much as six times the total of their actual deposits.

> Now the banks have everything in their hands. They make great issues, and money becomes plenty; . . . all other commodities become dear. Then the capitalist sells what he has to sell, while prices are high. The banks draw in their issues, and money becomes scarce, . . . all other commodities become cheap. The community becomes distressed for money, individuals are forced to sell property to raise money—and to sell at a loss on account of the state of the market: then the capitalist buys what he desires to buy, while everything is cheap. . . . The operation of the banking system is evident; . . .

He commented briefly on the impact that banking and credit organization was producing upon production and price levels. The corollary to credit monopoly, he noted, was an accompanying belief that price was determined by the amount of labor that different commodities could command, which he designated "the philosophy of speculation on human misfortune." "Considered from this point of view," Greene pointed out, "the price of commodities is regulated, not by the labor expended in their production, but by the distress and want of the laboring class." A vigorous proponent of the labor cost theory of value, as was Warren, he pronounced: 'There is no device of the political economists so infernal as the one which ranks labor as a commodity, varying in value according to supply and demand."[102] Greene stoutly held that the ratio of the supply of labor to the demand for it was unvarying because every producer was a consumer "to the precise extent of the amount of his products," and the price of labor ought therefore to be constant.

Greene admitted that there was not only a market price for commodities, which he believed to be based on supply and demand, but a "natural" price, as well, which depended on its cost of production. Although these were in a state of continual oscillation due to the credit system, under a proper system they would coincide at all times.[103] The phenomena of want and "overproduction" were directly attributable to the credit structure. "Many a tailor has carried his coat to a market where coats were at once voted *over production,* not because there was no real demand for coats, but because there was no *money demand* for them."[104] Credit as he saw it in operation was actually perpetuating feudalism. Money was furnished to individuals and corporations principally for purposes of speculation, advantageous to the speculators if successful, catastrophic to the community if a failure. Monopoly of trade or insecurity were the alternatives of "the existing organization of credit . . . the daughter of hard money, begotten upon it incestuously by that insufficiency of circulating medium which results from laws making specie the sole legal tender."[105]

---

[100] Greene used the term "usury" to mean interest in any form, which he considered the means whereby people were enabled to live without working. *Equality,* 14, 17, 28-30.

[101] *Equality,* 13.

[102] Greene, *Mutual Banking* (1870 ed.), 36.

[103] *Mutual Banking* (1870 ed.), 35.

[104] Greene, *Mutual Banking* (1850 ed.), 56. Emphasis is Greene's.

Greene's proposition for remedying the cyclical money shortage and the artificial control of the economy vested in the banking fraternity by the government was the "mutual bank." Any person could become a member of this bank by pledging mortgages to the bank on actual property, upon which he would be issued bills of exchange amounting to one-half of the total value of the mortgaged property.[106] No money was to be loaned to persons not members of the particular banking company, all members entering into a voluntary agreement to accept the paper of the bank in all payments, at par, when presented by fellow members. The rate of interest at which the money was to be loaned to the members was to be sufficient only to pay the operating expenses of the institution. Greene claimed that one per cent would be enough. Other principles of the mutual bank provided for the release of the member from his pledge when his mortgage had been redeemed, and a declaration promising perpetual non-redemption in specie of the bills of the bank.

What the Greene proposal amounted to was a mutual agreement on the part of a number of persons to monetize other values than specie to the amount of one-half of the declared valuation of a given volume of these other values, preferably real property. However, he once said, ". . . anything that may be sold under the hammer may be made a basis for the issue of mutual money."[107] At the time he originally proposed such a bank, he suggested that the undertaking be postponed until 10,000 persons signified their intentions of starting the organization. This he thought would insure the feeling of security on the part of the members, because all might inspect the books and thus observe on what basis all others were having money issued. This would be further strengthened by the psychological effect of 10,000 persons in the vicinity of such a bank, all using the bills in the member stores, hotels, theatres, tailor shops, restaurants and similar business enterprises, in payment for desired goods and services.[108]

Currency in sufficient volume to satisfy the need thereof was Greene's objective, which necessitated a complete divorce from the specie idea of redemption. However, he found no fault with having the valuation of the monetized property expressed with the silver dollar as the standard of value in mind, and the measure of value as well. Thus tied to the silver dollar, the mutual bank bills would rise and fall with the value of silver dollars, without fear of depreciation. Based on the dollar as the measure of value, the silver at a designated degree of fineness and weight as the standard of value, the mutual money was to serve only as an instrument of exchange.[109] Greene considered that such money would escape the evil consequences attending scarcity or excess of supply. It would always be worth its face value in silver dollars. Like Proudhon, he believed that the element of money which rendered it insecure was the doubt of final redemption in specie, and he proposed to eliminate this by generalizing the bill of exchange:[110]

---

[105] *Mutual Banking* (1850 ed.), 51.

[106] Originally the plan had provided for issuance of currency equal to three-fourths of the mortgaged valuation, but through a twenty year period was gradually set at one-half to provide for such contingencies as depreciation of the property mortgaged as well as the possibility of failure to sell at auction for the desired amount in case of default by bank member. *Mutual Banking* (1850 ed.), 24-25; *Mutual Banking* (1870 ed.), 29.

[107] *Mutual Banking* (1870 ed.), 29.

[108] *Equality,* 47-49.

> . . . that is to say, in making of it an anonymous title, exchangeable forever, and redeemable at sight, *but only in merchandise and services.* Or, to speak a language more comprehensible to financial adepts, the problem consists in *basing* bank paper . . . upon *products.*

The mutual bank was a "producer's bank," said Greene. Its currency was non-interest-bearing. The monetization of commodities other than gold and silver would tend to further depress the rate of interest. This would enable a person with only his labor to offer to easily borrow capital to engage in productive work and thus create capital goods of his own. Individuals would thus join a mutual bank company not in expectation of a dividend but to facilitate the procurement of money, a lowering rate of interest being substituted for the usual dividend incentive.[111]

Greene objected to the comparison of the mutual money with the disreputable "wildcat money" of a decade before on four grounds. The wildcat issues not only promised to redeem in specie, but professed to be based on specie which did not exist. By pretending to be gold and silver, they gravely "deranged" the currency. Without specie backing or any other guarantee, the money was principally borrowed by the stockholders of these wildcat banks. Mutual money, on the other hand, was not redeemable in specie, but in actual existing commodities of other types. Furthermore, issued against actual values, it was utilized by all who "insured" it, and had no more effect upon the precious metals than upon any other particular materials or commodities.[112]

What would be the consequences of decentralized mutual banking

---

109. *Mutual Banking* (1850 ed.), 40, 51-52; *Mutual Banking* (1870 ed.), 34-35.
110. *Mutual Banking* (1850 ed.), 19. Emphasis is Greene's.
111. *Equality,* 49-50; *Mutual Banking* (1850 ed.), 38, 41; *Mutual Banking* (1870 ed.), 50.
112. *Equality,* 49-50. Although mutual money was in the final analysis redeemable if a member of the bank defaulted, it was thought that foreclosures would be very infrequent, and losses of property to holders of the bills issued against it would not occur in any noticeable volume.

upon such a basis as Greene proposed? A frontal attack on the state was his conclusion:[113]

> Mutualism operates, by its very nature, to render political government, founded on arbitrary force, superfluous; that is, it operates to the decentralization of the political power, and to the transformation of the State by substituting self-government instead of government *ab extra.*

An investigation of American colonial history not only reinforced this conclusion but resulted in his abandonment of any claims to originality as far as the mutual bank idea was concerned. In actuality, Greene's and Kellogg's financial propositions had venerable antecedents in the history of eighteenth century Massachusetts, where "land banks"[114] remarkably similar to that of Greene had been proposed in 1714 and again in 1740. The earlier bank had never obtained the sanction of the General Court, and died in discussion, while that of 1740 actually operated for a time, with admitted success.[115] This latter bank, which received widespread popular support, nevertheless terminated abruptly. It was disallowed by the British Parliament, acting at the request of the governor and others whom Thomas Hutchinson designated as "men of estates and the principal merchants in the province."[116] Hutchinson, no friend of the venture, labeled its originators "persons in difficult or involved circumstances in trade, or such as were possessed of real estates but had little or no ready money at command," and supported primarily by those "generally of low condition among the plebeians and of small estate."[117]

Greene considered it highly significant that Hutchinson admitted the strength of the bank, confessing that "Had not parliament interposed, the province would have been in the utmost confusion, and the authority of government entirely in the land bank company."[118] It was Greene's interpretation that the principal disturbance created by the bank had been political rather than economic:[119]

---

[113] *Mutual Banking* (1870 ed.), 41.

[114] The standard treatment of this subject is that of Andrew McFarland Davis, *Currency and Banking in the Province of the Massachusetts Bay* (2 vols. New York, 1901). The project had been broached before by a Boston merchant, John Colman, who outlined the land bank proposition in a pamphlet, in circulation since 1684, titled *The Distressed State of the Town of Boston and Humbly Proposed Methods for Redress.* Albert Bushnell Hart (ed.), *Commonwealth History of Massachusetts* (5 vols. New York, 1928), II, 208.

[115] The influence of the closing of the land bank in creating colonial unrest has generally been neglected by historians. It was the opinion of John Adams that "the act to destroy the Land Bank Scheme raised a greater ferment in this province than the stamp-act did." *Novanglus and Massachusettensis: or Political Essays . . . by John Adams . . .* (and) *Jonathan Sewall . . .* (Boston, 1819), 39. See also Davis, *Currency and Banking,* II, chapter XII. It should be remembered that the term "land bank" was used in a much different connotation than it is today. This was a banking company which issued its own notes, rather than a mortgage bank or insurance company granting loans on farms or land, as is especially observed in portions of the cotton-growing South, in particular.

[116] Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of the Province of Massachusetts Bay* (3 vols., Boston, 1767), II, 394-396.

[117] Hutchinson, *History,* II, 207, 393.

> . . . Gov. Hutchinson ought to have explained more in detail the nature of the evils he complains of; and also to have told us why he, a declared enemy of popular institutions, opposed the advocates of the bank so uncompromisingly.

The discovery of a colonial precedent neither detracted from Greene's enthusiasm for his project nor cast any suspicions upon his independent status as an innovator. With the financial writings of others, however, he was already familiar, particularly Kellogg and Proudhon. It is highly probable that he learned from both,[120] even though later editions of his works carried sharp criticisms of some of their theories.[121] Favorable quotations of Kellogg in several of his works indicated a thorough reading at one time of *Labor and Other Capital.*[122] His knowledge of Proudhon appears to have been somewhat less thorough until after a stay in France in the late '50's, during which time he became personally acquainted with the internationally-known French anarchist.[123] It is most inaccurate to speak of Greene simply as a proponent of Proudhonian principles.

Coming at a time when the labor and consumer groups were experi-

---

118. Hutchinson, *History,* II, 396.
119. *Mutual Banking* (1870 ed.), 41. It was Greene's contention that the bank was a success, in that the members of the banking company and not the bill holders lost when they were forced to close abruptly.
120. Compare the Mutual Bank and the Kellogg National Fund especially on the basis of security of notes and issuance, and real property backing. *Mutual Banking* (1870 ed.), 29-37; Kellogg, *Labor and Other Capital* (1849 ed.), 248-271.
121. As early as 1850, Greene was criticizing Proudhon's *Banque du Peuple* for its potentialities for more highly integrating rather than decentralizing the currency. *Mutual Banking* (1850 ed.), 23-24.
122. In the 1857 edition of his work on banking, Greene bitterly disputed Kellogg's claim that the value of money depended on its power of accumulation through interest-bearing. Greene denounced interest-bearing currency as a creature of the "legislature," which would disappear when the mutual bank monetized all commodities and undermined the position of the scarcer specie legal tender. It was in this edition also that Greene made known his acquaintance with the colonial Land Bank. For the controversy with Kellogg see Greene, *The Radical Deficiency of the Existing Circulating Medium, and the Advantages of a Mutual Currency,* 203-205; *The Word,* III (September, 1874), 4.

    For references to Kellogg's critical observations in a generally approving tone in Greene's financial writings, consult *Equality,* 27; *Mutual Banking* (1870 ed.), 15-16; *Socialistic, Communistic, Mutualistic and Financial Fragments,* 129-130.
123. Greene thought very highly of Proudhon, although critical of some character traits; "He was too fond of vainglorious distinction and notoriety, and his amiability . . . led him too often, notwithstanding the violence of his writings, to listen favorably to proposals of compromise for the sake of peace and friendship." *The Word,* II (April, 1874), 4.

menting with "associated workshops" and "protective union stores," Greene suggested that the mutual bank be incorporated in the movement, forming what he called "complementary units of production, consumption, and exchange, . . . the triple formula of practical mutualism." This program of mutualism he considered best adapted to local community level. In times of economic distress, the mutual money would prove the bulwark against inflationary or deflationary pressures: "the town cannot fail disastrously, for the real property is always there, rooted in the very ground."[124]

For some time the campaign ran strongly to obtain a charter from the Massachusetts General Court for the establishment of a mutual bank. Greene, now in Boston, argued the case before the Town and Country Club of which he was a member, along with such notables as Ralph Waldo Emerson, Theodore Parker, Henry James, the elder, W. H. Channing, Octavius B. Frothingham, William D. Ticknor, Charles Sumner, E. R. Hoar, Henry Giles, John Orvis, and George B. Loring. Repeated petitions to the General Court were made in 1850-51 both under his sponsorship and that of groups of inhabitants of Brookfield, Ware and Warren.[125] In 1857 he restated his financial arguments in a volume titled *The Radical Deficiency of the Existing Circulating Medium, and the Advantages of a Mutual Currency,* under the stimulation of the new panic assailing the nation's economy. Apathy was the principal response. Shortly thereafter Greene left for France, where he became interested for a time in mathematics,[126] concern over social matters abating until after the war.

Greene's *Equality* contained other than his money and banking theories. Some of his sociological ideas, albeit evidencing little logical organization and often contradictory, appeared here and there in its pages. One was his assertion that as an individual, a man received certain rights at creation, but that the right of property was not one of them. This was a social creation, and was not absolute. "Society gives me . . . proprietorship . . . because it is for its own interests to do so; my right to my watch is not a natural, but a social right. I own it, not because I earned it, . . . but by the free grace and favor of society."[127] Greene's conception of individualism, however, was religious in nature. Although failing to describe the rights which the individual received from God, he condemned coercion of any kind as a contention against God Himself. It was therefore "profoundly immoral" to make a man dependent upon his neighbors or upon public opinion, which made him "subservient to his accidents, instead of supreme over them."[128]

---

[124] *Mutual Banking* (1850 ed.), 36-38.

[125] *Mutual Banking* (1850 ed.), 27-28; *Radical Deficiency,* introduction, vii, xi, xix; Higginson, *Yesterdays,* 175-176; *The Word,* XVIII (December, 1889), 2; *Spirit of the Age,* II, 51-52, 61, 69-71.

[126] See his published works on the subject; *An Expository Sketch of a New Theory of Calculus* (Paris, 1859); *Explanation of the Theory of Calculus* (Boston, 1870).

[127] *Equality,* 55-56.

In another respect he was much less indefinite. *Equality* contained one of the first of the anarchist arraignments of socialism as a system of societal organization. Socialism, averred Greene, was the only political system in which he could see no "good points." In other types he saw a few privileged groups such as nobles, slaveholders, or "usurers" who managed to gather some advantages as compared to the volume of evil endured by "the mass of the people," but no one appeared to gain under socialism:[129]

> In socialism, there is but one master, which is the state; but the state is not a living person, capable of suffering and happiness. Socialism benefits none but demagogues, and is, emphatically, the organization of universal misery . . . socialism gives us but one class, a class of slaves.

Written at a time when proponents of "state" socialism had hardly begun to state the theory, Greene's blast presaged the ideological conflict which was to break out in full flower in the anarchist and socialist journals of thirty-five years later.

Greene's career after his advocacy of the mutual bank was as much an account of irreconcilables as that which had previously transpired. Although abhorring government beyond the local level, he joined the Democratic party. At the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention of 1853 he championed minority representation and woman suffrage. He was also an outspoken abolitionist.[130] Wealthy by inheritance and marriage, he returned from his stay in France at the outbreak of the Civil War, and became commander of the 14th Massachusetts Regiment, later resigning after a quarrel with Governor Andrew.[131]

Activity in the ranks of the intellectual radicals once more absorbed his interest at the end of the war. He restated most of his social philosophy in a small book titled *Sovereignty of the People,* at about the time

---

[128] *Equality,* 73. Greene used the word "accident" in a way which might be applied to circumstances, environment, or to both.

[129] *Equality,* 70-71.

[130] Greene introduced over 30 separate petitions signed by several thousand women requesting permission to vote on the amendments and alterations to the state constitution. Consult appendices in *Official Report of the Debates and Proceedings in the State Convention, Assembled May 4th, 1853, to Revise and Amend the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (3 vols. Boston, 1853); *Journal of the Constitutional Convention of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Begun and Held in Boston on the Fourth Day of May, 1853* (Boston, 1853).

[131] Higginson is responsible for the account describing Greene's resignation from the Union Army as the result of a political quarrel. Conflicting stories are found in other sources. See *Record of the Massachusetts Volunteers, 1861-1865* (2 vols. Boston, 1868), I, 470; James L. Bowen, *Massachusetts in the War 1861-1865* (Springfield, Mass., 1889), 250, 724; *Massachusetts Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines in the Civil War* (7 vols. Norwood, Mass., 1932), V, 554-556.

Heywood's Worcester group began to demonstrate interest in the mutual bank literature. The reprinting of an enlarged edition of *Mutual Banking,* the formation of the Labor Reform Leagues, and Heywood's publication of *The Word* all found in Greene a ready supporter and participant. In the latter part of 1872 he became a member of the French Section of the Marxian International Working People's Association in Boston. Shortly afterward he became president of the New England Labor Reform League.[132] This affiliation placed the N. E. L. R. L. as a whole under suspicion as a branch of the International. The aims of the former were alleged to be a mere restatement of those of "the foreign communists."[133] Although he collaborated with French members in the formulation of an address outlining the principles of the International Working People's Association, which was subsequently read before the N. E. L. R. L. at the 1873 convention,[134] it appears that neither he nor the League continued relations. This is borne out by Greene's critical writings concerning communism and his first translations of Proudhon's writings.[135]

Between 1872-1876 Heywood and the League made several attempts to obtain a charter for a mutual bank from the Massachusetts General Court, but to no avail. The earliest of these was buried in the Committee on Banks and Banking, three of whose seven members were bankers themselves. The general treatment received strengthened the convictions of prominent members of the League that "legislatures are made up of capitalists who draw pay for serving their own interests, not the people's." Greene participated in general criticism of the legislature but gave no evidence of entertaining hope that opposition might be overcome.[136]

---

[132] Greene reprinted a translation of Proudhon's famous essay, *The State,* from the *Voix du Peuple* of December 3, 1849, in which the latter first used the term "anarchy" as a synonym for the stateless society, in *The Word,* I (August, 1872), 2.

[133] *The Word,* IV (March, 1876), 3.

[134] *Fragments,* 227. See pp. 237-261 in same work for a verbatim account of the address delivered before the N. E. L. R. L.

[135] His translation of Proudhon's *What Is Property?* began appearing in *The Word* in January, 1874, at which time he declared, "You will perceive that Proudhon and our friend Josiah Warren smite on substantially the same anvil." Warren abruptly repudiated the comparison. *The Word,* II (January, 1874), 4; *The Word,* II (March, 1874), 2. It would appear that Warren was aware of Proudhon two decades before this. In the first number of the *Periodical Letter,* I (July, 1854), 22, Warren wrote the following: "It has been said by 'Reformers' that 'all property was robbery' but this idea followed out would give every one as much claim upon the products of labor as the producer himself had—of course this would constitute universal robbery and world wide confusion." It would appear from the context that Warren was referring to Proudhon's *Qu'est ce que la Propriete?* but it is unlikely that he had read this work, and would have to be charged with misunderstanding Proudhon's position.

[136] The most famous of these petitions, that of April 6, 1873, signed by John Orvis, William B. Wright, Greene, Heywood and Tucker, is reprinted in *Fragments,* appendix. See also *The Word,* II (May, 1873), 2.

Greene returned to Europe in the spring of 1878. His premature death in Weston, England[137] during this same year brought to an end the career of the ablest native American anarchist writer and theorist on finance. *Mutual Banking* remained prominent in the individualist propaganda thereafter without additions or abridgement. It was widely read by those interested in radical currency, and has been reprinted repeatedly up to the present day.[138]

The contributions of Ezra Heywood and William B. Greene to native anarchist thought are important not only in themselves but also in their impact upon contemporaries and later converts. Ineffectual upon the radical movement as a whole due to their unconcern with class consciousness, they were regarded as mere examples of the petty bourgeois response to the grave and growing economic disarrangements of their time. Their importance in the transition period between the experimental colonies and the strictly intellectual propaganda of anti-statism cannot be ignored, for by 1890 their efforts had become recognized among radicals everywhere as a contribution to revolutionary social philosophy. Greene's currency ideas gradually became those which the latter-day anarchists supported, even though they represented a change from those originally developed by Warren. The "labor for labor" ideas embodied in the labor check system, found in the writings of both Warren and Andrews, dropped from the discussions of the problems of exchange. Mutual banking and currency based on a commodity standard of value, but allowing for the monetization of all durable wealth, now became the core of anti-statist finance. In like manner Warren's approach to the land problem was modified by the inclusion of more studied and abstract thinking by less radical exponents of reform.

---

[137] See obituary in *The Word,* VII (July, 1878), 2.

[138] The most recent edition is that of the Modern Publishers of Indore, India, under the auspices of the *Indian Sociological Review,* in 1946.

CHAPTER VI

Heralds of the Transition to Philosophical Egoism II

3. *J. K. Ingalls, Land Reformer*

The contributions of Greene to anarchist economics in formulating a system of finance adapted to the free economy were matched by those of Joshua K. Ingalls with respect to the land problem. Born in Swansea, Massachusetts on July 16, 1816,[1] his early life was spent in circumstances somewhat different than those which surrounded Heywood and Greene. There are a number of striking similarities upon comparison with the early training and careers of those of his fellow Yankees which may be observed, nevertheless.

Ingalls spent the first thirty years of his life in a period of tumultuous reform in many fields, getting involved in many of them. He became a convert to Quaker beliefs while still a boy. Temperance and the dietary ideas of Sylvester Graham claimed his attention and support for a time. During a period of employment as an industrial worker in Rhode Island, he enthusiastically backed the ten hour movement in that state, but withdrew after differences over a matter of tactics cooled his hopes of fundamental reform.[2] Impressed by a discussion on interest and its power to increase geometrically, he had argued that the basic dispute was not between the worker and his immediate employer but between the workers as "producers" and those whom he designated as "accumulators." These persons he called the "interest and profit getters" during his later years.[3] He admitted finding little or no support for this theory, the laborers of his acquaintance being as favorable to accepting interest on what little they might put aside as those operating on a much larger scale. A brief career in the ministry, during which he invoked biblical remonstrances against the taking of interest while denying the power of capital and money to multiply of themselves, prepared the way for his full-fledged participation in economic radicalism.

---

[1] See biographical sketch in *Social Science,* I (September 28, 1887), 2-3. A partial list of his writings can be found in Nettlau, *Bibliographie,* 9.

[2] Ingalls, *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian in the Fields of Industrial and Social Reform,* 3, 9-10, 13-14, 16-19, 21.

[3] Ingalls, *Reminiscences,* 11, 22. Ingalls was reluctant to discuss his early years as a preacher; "They are hardly in a line with the social, industrial and economic investigations which have engrossed my more mature thoughts," he commented briefly. For indications of a favorable attitude toward spiritualism on his part see his article "The Power of Right," in *The Spiritual Age,* I (September 12, 1875), 77-78.

By 1841 he was espousing the labor theory of value and attempting to impress his listeners with the deteriorating effects of interest-taking. He made the acquaintance of the leading figures in the Land Reform Society in 1845,[4] and henceforth his interest in a religious career began to wane. From this time on his name was mentioned more and more in connection with those of George Henry Evans, John Windt, John Commerford, William Rowe, Henry Beeney, A. J. H. Duganne, W. H. Van Amringe, Louis Hine, Lewis Masquerier and others interested in passage of legislation restricting the size of land holdings.[5] Interest in land limitation in one aspect or another was to be a prominent part of his life for over half a century thereafter.

Ingalls' next five years was a period of constant participation in a variety of reform and radical groups and movements. Besides attendance at the Industrial Congresses of 1847 and 1848, his activities brought him into contact with currency reformers, Fourierites, anti-slavery men, and the small association of anarchists in New York.[6] He described the attempt of the land reformers to place a presidential ticket in the field in 1848, when the Industrial Congress met in Philadelphia, and the dissolution of the land limitation plank within the more sensational slavery issue during the creation of the Free Soil party.[7]

Ingalls, along with Evans, Windt and Van Amringe, stuck to land reform in the face of charges of indifference to the plea for freedom for the negro brought against them by anti-slavery preachers and those whom he preferred to call the "strict constructionists." This same charge was made against members of the "laboring class," he noticed, by prominent anti-slavery members of the community. Ingalls insisted that laborers could not profess moral and social duties which the abolitionists considered proper for them to demonstrate while insecure, deprived of land and home, and surrounded by the "trickeries" of business and the domineering of the professional men. It was the contention of Ingalls that the abolition of slavery and the abolition of land monopoly were inseparable. The abolition of slavery would have little effect on land monopoly, but abolition of land monopoly would make slavery impossible.[8] He further argued that competition among the most poorly paid class of wage workers would be greatly intensified by the influx of "free" negro labor, and setting a man free without allowing him access to land was a mockery. In a debate with Frederick Douglass in Providence, Rhode Island in November 1848, Ingalls declared that "the rent system and the wage system had broken up more families and separated more husbands and wives than ever had chattel slavery."[9]

---

[4] Reading George Henry Evans' *Young America* convinced him that the "usury of land," or ground rent, was the structure upon which the money and property systems were founded.

[5] See the short description of Ingalls as a land reformer in Lewis Masquerier, *Sociology*, 125.

[6] *Reminiscences*, 25; Commons, *Documentary History*, VII, 288-352; VIII, 21-78; Octavius B. Frothingham, *Life of Gerrit Smith*, 194.

[7] Ingalls' particular interest in this campaign was the possible inclusion of a land limitation law in the platform and the passage of a bill similar to the Homestead Act. *Reminiscences*, 25-27.

Gerrit Smith received the hearty support of the land reform group, his views on the land question being hardly less radical than theirs. In an address at Troy, N.Y., April 14, 1851, he denounced land monopoly as "a crime," while asserting that "government positively and expressly permits it. Still worse, it does itself practice it. Government is itself the great land monopolist." His proposed resolution at the Liberty Party convention at Cazenovia, N. Y., July 3, 1849, designating land monopoly as "the most widespread of all oppressions," was passed unanimously. Frothingham, *Gerrit Smith*, 182-183, 188-189. A recent interpretation of Smith has dismissed his land reform propaganda as erratic and irresponsible. See Ralph V. Harlow, *Gerrit Smith, Philanthropist and Reformer* (New York, 1939), 241-258.

Ingalls eventually took a completely materialistic point of view toward the institution, asserting that it was not love of being a master but the ability to appropriate the results of labor which made slaveholding attractive. It was not prejudice and enmity toward slaves that restrained white laborers from supporting emancipation but fear that liberty would help negroes to crowd them from their wage-earning opportunities.[10] Although his argument had little effect, it still remained part of his philosophy after Reconstruction. Failure of the administration to effect any substantial alteration in land ownership in the South was a source of curiosity to him, and passage of the Homestead Act left him unimpressed. He considered it "so emasculated by political trickery" that it did little to alleviate the conditions of the increasing numbers of the landless, while enough land had been voted to railroads by the politicians to have furnished a farm of 25 acres to every family in the country.[11]

The failure of the land reformers to make a satisfactory alliance with the anti-slavery forces ended Ingalls' interest in national politics. It was during this same time that his initial concern with economic reform was increased by contact with other groups of thinkers pre-occupied with economic radicalism. While at the home of Theodore Dwight Weld,[12] he met John H. and Freeman Hunt, and through these men, Edward

---

8. While editing a small land reform paper, *The Landmark,* in 1848, Ingalls spoke under the sponsorship of Gerrit Smith on this and other topics, on a tour of Madison, Cayuga and Herkimer counties in New York. *Reminiscences,* 28-30.

9. *Reminiscences,* 38.

10. *Reminiscences,* 41. It was his observation that by 1850 the economic discussion of slavery was commonplace; "Slavery should be abolished because *free* labor is *cheaper,* and would increase the wealth of the employer more rapidly." Go where you may, this selfism meets you." Ingalls in *Spirit of the Age,* II, 43. Stress is Ingalls'.

11. *Reminiscences,* 27.

12. *Reminiscences,* 43.

Kellogg, whose *Labor and Other Capital,*[13] destined to be the bible of the Greenbackers and the National Labor Union, had just been published. Although disagreeing with Kellogg's doctrine that one of the proper functions of money was to earn interest for its owner, he saw much in his work which was commendable.[14] He contributed to Fourierite papers, including the *Univercoelum,* from time to time, but refused to unite with them in any project due to their refusal to subscribe to the limitation scheme of land occupation.

Ingalls' first acquaintance with anarchism took place at about this time also. As a contributor to *The Spirit of the Age,* a Fourierist periodical edited by William H. Channing, he first learned of the work of P. J. Proudhon through the series of articles written by Charles A. Dana in the late fall of 1849.[15] At about the same time he also met Josiah Warren and Stephen Pearl Andrews in New York, preparing for the settlement of "Modern Times." He admitted being influenced by the ideas of these three men: "I was impressed with the accuracy of their statement of the industrial, economic, financial and social questions." But he became no closer associated with them than with the Fourierists a few years earlier, due to his concern over land reform.[16] Neither of these two groups considered land limitation doctrines of any value. Ingalls felt they were the solution to the problem of poverty:[17]

> The earth, with its vast resources of mineral wealth, its spontaneous productions and its fertile soil, the free gift of God and the common patrimony of mankind, has for long centuries been held in the grasp of one set of oppressors, by right of conquest or right of discovery; and is now held by another, through the right of purchase from them. All of man's natural possessions . . . have been claimed as property; nor has man himself escaped the insatiate jaws of greed. This invasion of his rights and possessions has resulted . . . in clothing property with a power to accumulate an income.

Having given up belief in effecting reforms through legislation, Ingalls also entered the field of colonization in hopes of achieving a way of life free from commercialism. In December 1849, while in Southington, Connecticut, he began plans for the establishment of a community.[18] Whether he was aware of the Warrenite town in Ohio or not was never indicated, but his plans and objectives pointed in a very similar direction. Through the pages of the *Spirit of the Age* he sought persons interested in a small coöperative. A capital backing of from $200-$300 per family was thought sufficient, while investment of other capital by outsiders was considered, provided "capital could be satisfied with a return of value for value, a simple conservation of its worth." It was Ingalls' intention "to build up a community where rent and interest and even speculative profit would be practically unknown, and the conveniences for social life, education, etc. . . . gradually and naturally developed."[19]

---

[13] Ingalls wrote a review of this book which was published in *The Univercoelum* of April 21 and April 28, 1849.

[14] "Any system," he wrote, "securing a premium to capital, however small, must result in the want, degradation and servitude of one class, and in bestowing unearned wealth and power upon another . . .; the product of human labor can only be exchanged for the product of human labor." *Spirit of the Age,* I, 115; II, 146-147.

[15] Dana's articles were titled "European Socialism." *Spirit of the Age,* I, 209-211, 324-326, 358-359, 371-372. The now-defunct *Univercoelum* and the earlier *Harbinger* had become incorporated in this periodical.

[16] *Reminiscences,* 51-52.

[17] Ingalls, in *Spirit of the Age,* I, 243-246.

He expected the contemplated colony, variously designated as the "Mutual Township," the "Co-operative Brotherhood," and finally the "Valley Farm Association,"[20] to grow in a logical manner, commencing with the purchase of "select public lands," which were to be prepared for cultivation by an advance group. The next step was to be the coöperative construction of log cabins, with the utilization of "labor-saving" machinery commencing soon after. Carpenters, masons, blacksmiths and other artisans were anticipated at the site as fast as their services could be utilized. Beyond the land arrangement which restricted land appropriations to ten acres per member of the colonizing families, and prohibition against taking or paying rent or interest, no aspects of "blueprinting" were evident in the projected settlement. It was Ingalls' belief that the group would form their own organization along lines of voluntary association when the experiment in social living had been practically and successfully demonstrated. "Every man will be rewarded according to his work" was to be the motto, the understanding being that each was to receive the "whole product of his labor."[21]

Hopeful of accomplishing the desired ends without excessive capital investments or a large number of participants, he went ahead with plans for possible locations, finally settling on a site on the Little Kanawha River in West Virginia between Parkersburg and Marietta. Meetings in January and February, 1850 in New York City resulted in a larger volume of interest in the projected colony than he believed existed. Individuals from Maine to Ohio expressed desires to become party to the undertaking, which began almost spontaneously without Ingalls' participation a short while later during his attendance at an Industrial Congress in Chicago.[22]

If the Valley Farm Association was intended to become a halfway experiment between the Fourierist and anarchist examples already attempted, the effort was to prove unsatisfactory, from Ingalls' point of view at least. The history of the colony is obscure. Ingalls reported that coöperative ideas were abandoned at an early date, but that the group, somewhat diminished in numbers, continued to have a pleasant existence and to enjoy comfortable homes and a congenial social environment. As late as 1865 he reported that there was still a settlement functioning on this location. This brought his participation in, or initiation of, such interests to an end: "I abandoned the idea of becoming a Moses, or even a Joshua, of an associative movement," he soberly observed many years later.[23] Activity in reform was for him from now on a matter "purely of good will."

---

[18] Ingalls, "Method of Transition for the Consideration of the True Friends of Human Rights and Human Progress," in *Spirit of the Age,* I, 385-387.

[19] *Reminiscences,* 56.

[20] *Reminiscences,* 57; *Spirit of the Age,* II, 56-57.

[21] Ingalls, "Method of Transition," in *Spirit of the Age,* I, 387.

[22] Ingalls in *Spirit of the Age,* II, 203-204.

The death of George Henry Evans in 1856, followed by the Civil War and the passing of the Homestead Act, all served to inhibit and neutralize the activities of the National Land Reform Association for a time. It once more became active with the advent of leaner times and the dispersal of wartime prosperity in the early 70's. Its members communicated with the Land Tenure Reform Association and the Land and Labour League of England during the summer of 1872, although the objectives of the American group differed utterly from those of the English organizations, which favored land nationalization.[24] The Evans associates had stressed legislation limiting the size of land holdings. Now, under the influence of Ingalls, the corresponding secretary, their sole approach was centered around a campaign calling for the repeal of existing legislation and land laws which granted protection to land titles not based on personal occupancy.

Ingalls' activities were not confined to the Land Reform Association. He was one of a considerable group of New England anarchists[25] who formed the American Labor Reform League. He wrote for Heywood's *Word* from its inception, as well as contributing to a variety of other reform and radical periodicals. At the same time he produced a succession of pamphlets which hammered away at economic evils in the post-war economy of concentration and centralization.

Although absorbed in studying the influence of business failures, credit stringency and the financial panic, as well as the effects of the return to the gold standard, Ingalls stubbornly adhered to his favorite thesis: monopolization of the soil as the principal source of economic disorder and distress. In a pamphlet titled *Land and Labor,* which

---

[23] *Reminiscences,* 57. Ingalls' plan may also have been influenced by what he had learned concerning the Shakers, whom, like Robert Owen, he admired for their economic success and absence of exploitation of less-favored members.

[24] *Reminiscences,* 60, 63, 78, 86.

[25] Ingalls was a welcome addition to the group. Wrote Heywood: "After Josiah Warren and Wm. B. Greene, from no other American have we received so much genuine intellectual assistance in labor reform as from J. K. Ingalls." *The Word,* VII (April, 1880), 2.

Heywood published for him early in 1872, in numerous articles in the *Word,* and in two other short works appearing in 1878 under the titles *Work and Wealth* and *Periodical Business Crises,* he discussed the land issue.[26] He insisted that any hope from "schemes of currency and finance" was "wholly fallacious" as long as land remained "the subject of speculative monopoly"; "Repeal our unreasonable land laws, half feudal and half civil, so that organized injustice can no longer have the land for its fulcrum, and you will find the lever money, now so weighty for wrong, to be the most serviceable and inoffensive of servants."[27] He sanctioned land limitation by occupation and use alone, still believing that a labor exchange currency on the basis of the time note advocated by Warren would solve the problem of the medium of exchange.

In *Periodical Business Crises* Ingalls presented the theory that the time required to allow a debt to double at 7% compound interest was roughly that which comprised the interval between depressions, and suggested that the government refuse to enforce the collection of any debt the amount of the face of which had already been paid in interest. In this category he placed the public debt, insisting that for the government to maintain "this species of property" at par, while other property was depreciating in some cases as much as half, was outright discrimination in favor of a particular group which "rendered no service to society."[28]

Public opinion at this time was slowly becoming conscious of the industrial and commercial tycoon. Ingalls noted the influence of a new group of finance capitalists whose control of ownership of the soil was quietly but steadily advancing "as effectually as that of the titled nobility of any country ever did." The government made no effort to correct the trend by legislation, and appeared to be professing that nothing could be done to alleviate the situation, which to him was pure hypocrisy. "May we not be allowed to inquire," Ingalls interrogated, "into the workings of that legislation which has so lavishly bestowed, particularly in the last fifteen years, upon speculative schemes, to aid moneyed corporations, and enterprising adventurers of every description . . .?"[29] If new legislation could not be passed, it still remained possible to repeal some of that existing, which led either to land monopoly or protected that already under monopoly. "The whole produce of labor belongs to the laborer, and is his natural reward," he said,

---

26. *The Word,* II (May, 1873), 3; (September, 1873), 1-2; V (July, 1876), 1-2; IX (May, 1880), 3.
27. *The Word,* V (August, 1876), 1.
28. Ingalls, *Periodical Business Crises,* 7. It was his contention that the war debt had been repaid several times in interest premiums, and hinted at the possibility that the war had been paid for as it was fought, thus casting a suspicious shadow over the whole matter of war debt as generally conceived. *Periodical Business Crises,* 12. Lysander Spooner was arriving at much the same conclusions but independently of Ingalls. See Chapter VII, note 118.
29. *Periodical Business Crises,* 2.

and absentee ownership, backed by the courts and the police, absorbed part of this by compelling the payment of ground rent.[30] If such a doctrine was false, heretical, and incendiary, as it generally was regarded by the daily press, still there is little doubt as to its grass-roots origin.

Ingalls had presented a theoretical case for the repeal of land laws as an incentive to bringing about occupation and use-tenure. His writings now took on a more pessimistic tone with the publication of *Work and Wealth*[31] under avowedly anarchistic sponsorship. There were new ideas expressed in this brief study, some of them decidedly conservative and backward-looking. But his main point, emphasis upon the fundamental evil of land monopoly, was as prominent as ever. It was by this time wholeheartedly subscribed to by the Warrenite adherents. Ingalls contended that there were only two factors in production of wealth, land and labor. In line with his anti-interest stand, he identified capital as merely past labor and land frozen into a particular form and undeserving of increase in itself. To him the granting of a share of production to capital was placing a premium on past labor at the expense of present labor.[32]

It was a source of annoyance to him to see organized labor engrossed over wages and hours, to the exclusion of so vital a matter as land. He could not understand why it was not plain to all that private ownership of the soil by a few had supplanted slavery as the device whereby one man garnered wealth produced by the many. He believed that it was now time for the laboring man to become concerned with the sources of wealth, its production, and its distribution. The issue was not whether it was unwise to interfere with forces which had been transmitted "from previously existing conditions," but whether it was time to attempt a "truly scientific solution" of the problem of production and the inequalities of distribution.[33]

He had no new recommendations to make concerning the area of his greatest interest, the land. It was with considerable regret that he commented upon the failure of the government to establish "a system of easy access to the soil or a judicious limitation to private ownership."[34] Such a course of action would have prevented the capital-labor, or employer-employee question from ever having become important. Yet he now shunned political action through the two major parties, whose leaders he thought had formed a "mutual ring," conspiring "to make the plunder of public funds and public trusts a fine art."[35] He insisted that freedom of access to the soil and the opportunity for self-employment was a civil right, but felt that the process of concentration had proceeded to such an extent that it was a matter beyond the powers of working men to make right. All that remained was hope of benevolent action in the interests of the masses of the people on the part of a group of "social knights-errant." Thinking in terms of Robert Owen, whom he greatly admired, along with Peter Cooper and Gerrit Smith, he thought men such as these might "organize industries on an equitable basis, promote emigration to districts less under landlord control, and channel charities into promoting self-employment and self-help."[36]

---

[30] *Periodical Business Crises,* 3-5.

[31] This was first published as an article in the *Radical Review* in February, 1878, and subsequently issued separately as a pamphlet in 1881. Citations noted are from the *Radical Review*.

[32] *Radical Review,* I. 655.

[33] *Radical Review,* I, 652, 654-656. It was his conviction that a group could not become inordinately rich without another becoming correspondingly poor. Like Warren it was his belief that mutual exchange of labor could not produce inordinate inequality.

[34] *Radical Review,* I, 653. Ingalls at this time had no objection to a government system of land distribution involving some of the features of nationalization, if it could result in a limitation upon the total acreage held by each land owner.

The appearance of Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* in 1880 brought from Ingalls, now a veteran of over 35 years in the fight for land reform, a number of scholarly attacks. Primarily reflecting his fear of the state, now somewhat expanded by the reading of the anarchist works of Proudhon, he concentrated on the possible effects of the state as a landlord, which he thought would result from the nationalization doctrine of George. Closer reading and comparison with his own economic concepts resulted in a wholesale indictment of George in the matter of fundamentals as well. This was fully developed in *Social Wealth* (1885) which, but for Ingalls' dismissal of the currency question, might have become a general textbook of anarchist economics.

Ingalls, writing in the *Irish World,* as well as the anarchist periodicals *The Word*[37] and *Liberty,*[38] asserted repeatedly that the logical consequence of the single tax was to convert all land occupants into tenants of the state. The annihilation of the class of allodial landholders in such fashion did not furnish protection from further extension of state power, nor did it eliminate the possibility of unlimited control of land through leasehold. This he thought would lead to a group of super-taxpayers, able to shunt the burden on to others less favorably situated. The end process would be the eventual payment of the tax by the lowest economic group, which to him meant the agricultural workers. Ingalls suspected the possibility of an alliance between government officials and large taxpayers under such a system as another grave source of corruption and abuse.[39]

---

[35] *Radical Review,* I, 659.

[36] *Radical Review,* I, 653-654, 659-660.

[37] See *The Word,* X (October, 1882), 1. This was a violent attack upon the concept of government ownership, and the land policy of the United States from the time of the adoption of the Constitution onward.

[38] Ingalls was probably the first of the libertarians to write under his own name for Benjamin Tucker's *Liberty.* Tucker published the famous *Henry George Examined. Should Land Be Nationalized or Individualized?* as a special unpaginated supplement in *Liberty,* II (October 14, 1882). This was later issued as a pamphlet by Heywood in 1888.

In *Social Wealth* he continued in a much more forceful manner his criticism of taxing powers, which he called "the very essence of despotism," and incapable of justification unless it was "in equation with some service which the taxing power rendered the taxed individual." Once taxation got beyond the voluntary stage and became a compulsory thing, Ingalls averred that there was no point in arguing about forms of government, since any system employing compulsory taxation was a "despotism." The use of taxation to right obvious wrongs was to him a makeshift. It served only to obscure the injustices which were causing the evil results that taxation intended to abate.[40]

Social Wealth, a work which was advertised and sold for fifteen years to the readers of the anarchist periodical press, is valuable primarily as a radical estimate of the landholding and business systems of America in the mid-80's. Its main theme was that capitalism was essentially a super-structure erected upon a monopoly of land. Condemnation of the government as being responsible for this, and advocacy of the occupation-and-use-criteria as the basis of future land tenure, made it a substantial piece of propaganda for the native anarchist movement.

The fundamental idea underlying Ingalls' stand on the land question was his interpretation of rent. Rent, he contended, was a political and not an economic affair. He stubbornly disagreed with the Ricardian school, which insisted that it was essential and could not be gotten rid of. To him this was the admission that "landlordism" could never be eliminated, and itself was based on the assumption that land was a commodity.[41] This theory he claimed to be a by-product of the land title, and therefore of the governing power. If monopoly of the soil could once be established, then its owners were in a position to demand whatever the competitive forces of relative fertility and population pressure might bring. To reduce land to the status of a commodity was an act of usurpation, enabling a group to "profit by its relation to production" without the expenditure of labor time.[42]

Ingalls charged that the economists hardly made a pretense of discussing the origins of land titles, ignoring the subject because they

---

[39] See Ingalls, "Land Reform in 1848 and 1888," in *Liberty,* IV (June 9, 1888), 5. Ingalls here developed his interpretation and comparison of Evans and George favorable to the former but rejecting the political methods of both.

[40] Ingalls, *Social Wealth,* 255-258, 263-264, 271-272.

[41] *Social Wealth,* 45.

[42] "Look at the question of private dominion of the land in whatever light we may, we can find it to originate in usurpation only, whether of the camp, the court or the market. Whenever such dominion excludes or deprives a single human being of his equal opportunity, it is a violation, not only of the public right, and of the social duty, but of the very principle of law and morals upon which property itself is based . . ." Ingalls, *Social Wealth,* 153-154.

"could give no justification to the system, for to trace any title back will yield us nothing . . . but forceful and fraudulent taking, even were land a proper subject for taking at all."[43] He advanced four reasons why he believed land was not a subject for permanent tenure and sale because: (1) it was not a product of human labor; (2) it was limited in amount and therefore unable to react to "demand" by increasing in "supply"; (3) it could not be removed and therefore could not be transferred; and (4) occupancy limited ownership and ended with abandonment of the location by the occupant or by his death.[44] "Possession remains *possession,* and can never become *property,* in the sense of absolute dominion, except by positive statute. Labor can only claim *occupancy,* and can lay no claim to more than the usufruct."[45] One could hardly overlook the Jeffersonian flavor of this declaration, despite its conflict with existing and relatively unchallenged social usages with respect to land.

Ingalls disagreed completely with the Ricardian theory of rent, which maintained that rent was not an "arbitrary tribute," resting not upon usurpation but the excess of product of the best land over the poorest. Was rent something which failed to exist until population increase forced the use of less productive soils? Ingalls maintained that the reverse was true; it was rent which forced the use of less productive soils. An increase of population, resulting in the need for land which could be denied by its titled holders, was the cause of rent.[46] The end product of increased population in his view was a reduction in the number of landholders and an increase in tenancy. The result tended to approximate the extremes found in many parts of Europe, a landed aristocracy at one pole and a "wretched proletariat" at the other. It was his conviction, in the final analysis, that interest and profits were far more exploitive than rent, a point which he stated Henry George had neglected and which vitiated the latter's whole plan.[47]

Ingalls claimed that capitalism in its existing form in the United States had been successful largely as a result of the successful playing of individual and social forces one against the other.[48] Individual license had been used to monopolize wealth on the one hand, social forces as means of subjecting rebellious individuals on the other. Having gained exclusive control of the land by supporting individualism and personal freedom it then utilized social and civil powers to render its dominion absolute. Business was thus engaged simultaneously in lauding personal individual freedom and the omnipotence of the state, with the stress depending upon the advantage to be gained at the particular moment. Thus it was possible to observe campaigns to obtain high tariffs and subsidies through government aid, while at the same time the same interests were discouraging government attempts to ameliorate bad labor conditions, under the pretext that the latter course of action was an infringement upon the laborer's freedom of contract.[49]

---

[43] *Social Wealth,* 160-161, 305.
[44] *Social Wealth,* 272.
[45] *Social Wealth,* 125.
[46] *Social Wealth,* 68-70, 73.
[47] *Social Wealth,* 71, 165, 282-283.
[48] *Social Wealth,* 9, 40-42, 47.

Although not as exhaustive an investigator into the anarchist theory of decay of competition as a cause of trusts as were some of his associates, the fact that equality of opportunity no longer existed under prevailing laws and customs was proof enough to Ingalls that defenders of the *laissez-faire* notions were guilty of large scale misrepresentation of the facts. He had no respect for the fanciful dogmas of Spencerian social evolution, based on Darwinian concepts of survival-of-the-fittest. It was the task of social science to effect intelligent rather than natural selection; for instance, in the case of farmers, weeds were the principal result of the latter course. Even the great advocates of natural selection, Spencer and Tyndall, were themselves the recipients of governmental assistance at one time. The preaching of such ideas in American colleges was equally absurd:[50]

> Not only the institution which boasts the possession of a Sumner among its faculty, but every institution of its kind in our country is endowed by public or private beneficence, and could not survive a day if it should be withdrawn. It cannot fail to be seen how appropriate is the teaching of "laissez-faire" by the professors and scholars produced by institutions supported and upheld by the very opposite practice, . . . a system of capitalism dependent wholly upon laws and customs established and maintained to thwart equal opportunity and to prevent freedom of competition and exchange.

Ingalls indulged in no personal diatribes. He was firmly convinced that institutions rather than individuals were the issue. He saw no relief in reversing the positions of those in authority and those subjected to their direction. The wage worker turned "boss," the "victim of usury," the tenant turned usurer or rent-taker, all found the system good, upon receiving the favors it bestowed. Violent revolution was no answer, nor was legislation a fundamental reform. From his vantage-point, it appeared that the courts and judges would always reflect the social attitudes of the men of wealth. Even if temporarily eclipsed, there remained no assurance that their return to power would not result in demolishing the rectification of inequity achieved in their absence. Looking about him at the activities of the economic and social reformers, he saw what he characterized the same "infatuation" with specific remedies in the form of statutory provision. "A prohibitive law," he observed in one instance, "is the dream of the reformer who seeks to

---

49. *Social Wealth,* 11, 13, 52-53, 74-75, 297.
50. *Social Wealth,* 183-184.

make the world temperate." Adhering to one of the fundamental positions of anarchist political philosophy, that improvements in civil institutions could be best brought about by education rather than by legislation, he insisted that eradication of social and economic "disease" would come from repeal of laws rather than further enactment of others.[51]

This policy he considered the effective solution to the problem of land monopoly. It need not be a drastic procedure, nor work a summary change. Present legal possessors of land might well retain their titles for the remainder of their lifetime, but subsequent titles would be geared strictly to occupancy and use. Thus no one would be deprived of rights currently enjoyed, but would be denied the opportunity of either conferring or acquiring future privileges operating to the detriment of others. Alfred Russel Wallace's similar proposal of gradualism in land nationalization for England no doubt had some influence in resolving Ingalls' practical suggestions.[52]

One of his firm convictions was the inevitability of land redistribution in the future. He did not predict the frequency of attempts, the path it might take, or the degree of peace or violence which might attend it. Slavery, sporadically eliminated, would recur in other forms until the general realization dawned that one's own person was the natural limit to property in human beings. In a similar manner he maintained that the natural limit to property in land would be understood as the amount each person might occupy and use.[53]

Although living in virtual retirement in Glenora, New York, during the period of greatest literary activity among the native anarchist protagonists, Ingalls continued to supply steady contributions, principally in the nature of variations upon his favorite land theme. His hesitancy in openly allying with the Tucker group and *Liberty*[54] stemmed primarily from the preoccupation of most of this faction with currency reform,[55] a matter of universal interest in almost all portions of American society in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Adhering to his land ideas, he deplored all theorizing which preached relief through the medium of currency reform, especially that of the Greenbackers and other elements clamoring for cheap money.[56] The issuance of fiat money by the state would certainly result in its being obtained by loan at decreased interest rates, he was willing to concede, but the inevitable rise in the price level would quickly nullify any possible gains which might be made by the "debtor classes." In any juggling of the monetary system, Ingalls opined, the workers would eventually have to bear the burden, either through paying increased interest or standing for any losses which might result:[57]

---

[51] *Social Wealth,* 266-267, 287-289, 307.

[52] Alfred Russel Wallace, *Land Nationalisation, Its Necessity and Aims. Being a Comparison of the System of Landlord and Tenant, With That of Occupying Ownership in Their Influence on the Well-being of People* (London, 1882).

[53] *Social Wealth,* 286-300, 308-309.

[54] Ingalls was quoted from continually in *Liberty.* Wrote M. E. Lazarus, another land reform anarchist, "to be a pronounced anarchist, he lacks only the courage of his convictions." *Liberty,* III (January 23, 1886), 8. For Ingalls' point of view on his relations with the Tucker associates, see *Reminiscences,* 119-121.

[55] The Tuckerites and other mutualists criticized Ingalls for a tendency to imply that the "free land" program would induce people to abandon the use of money. Alfred B. Westrup, *The New Philosophy of Money,* 173-174.

> It is only stupidity which prevents the currency reformer from seeing that the fantastic tricks wrought with money values are mainly due to the ability of a class, through pliant legislators, to play fast and loose with the instruments of commerce, so as to effect a sliding fulcrum to the economic balance; and by which even the legal tender may be made to mean a day or a half day's work, according as a class are to pay it out, or have it paid to them.

Ingalls' writings in the 90's reflected more and more the political philosophy of anarchism. In an environment which was characterized by an increase of governmental powers and reform by statute law,[58] his hope for a negative and gradually weakening political institution waned. The American government, in his words, was becoming little more than "a police force to regulate the people in the interests of the plutocracy."[59] The growth of centralization and "authoritative socialism" were more threatening circumstances than the negative stand of the anarchists. At one time he expressed the fear that an alliance between church and state was impending[60] despite the long standing contrary American tradition. His fear arose from the increased influence of religious organizations in seeking passage of sumptuary legislation dealing with personal morality. His unconditional disapprobation of the use of violence partially influenced the attitude he held toward labor unions, although he saw justification for them as protection against employer combinations.[61] All the advantages lay on the side of the indus-

---

56. See Ingalls, "The Productivity of Capital," in *Social Science,* I October 5, 1887), 12-13; *Fair Play,* II (March 2, 1890), 64-65; *Fair Play,* III (March, 1891), 182-184.
57. Ingalls, *Economic Equities: A Compend of the Natural Laws of Industrial Production and Exchange,* 54-55.
58. *Social Wealth,* 286; *Economic Equities,* 54, 57, 62-63; *Reminiscences,* 172.
59. Ingalls, *The Unrevealed Religion,* 22.
60. *Unrevealed Religion,* 19, 24; *Fair Play,* III (March, 1891), 211-214.
61. *Economic Equities,* 59-60; Ingalls, *Social Industry, or the Sole Source of Increase,* 5, 10; *Reminiscences,* 169-170. Ingalls was impressed by the use of the militia in the 1877 railroad strike and the police in the Haymarket case. It was his judgment that unemployed laborers would always be enlisted as police, soldiers and militia and used in these capacities to break strikes. "It is the wage worker who is mostly responsible for our pernicious system, under which capitalism flourishes and industry pines; it is by his ballot and his bayonet by which usurpation is maintained." *Fair Play,* I (January 19, 1889), 4.

trial monopolist in any given strike for higher wages under the existing arrangement. Nevertheless he considered the only "intelligent" strike one which would be directed against wage work altogether.

A younger generation of anarchist writers took from Ingalls' thought only the portions which best expressed their contentions. His long record in the struggle for land reform and his ultimate rejection of political action as a means of obtaining it made him a prominent figure in the anti-statist band. Occupation-and-use tenure of land, a nearly-forgotten theory in non-radical circles, became firmly established in anarchist teaching from the time of J. K. Ingalls.

4. *Stephen Pearl Andrews, Social Philosopher*

The course of American anarchism from the times of Josiah Warren to those of Benjamin Tucker includes the career of a fourth prominent exponent, Stephen Pearl Andrews, a participant in a number of reform and radical movements, but who, of the early group, was the only person to take part in the native anarchist movement in all its phases.

Andrews was born a few months before the outbreak of the War of 1812, in Templeton, Massachusetts,[62] but followed an older brother to the South, where he experienced the insecure life of the reformer for the first time as a part of the anti-slavery movement. As a young lawyer, first in Louisiana and then in Texas, he achieved local notoriety from 1835 to 1843 as an opponent of slavery. In the latter year he was mobbed and driven out of Houston, reappearing a short while later in London as an agent of independent abolitionists of Texas. He put before Lord Aberdeen and Lord Palmerston a plan for the emancipation of Texan slaves through the medium of a British loan to Texas sufficient to cover their purchase and release. At this point he was abruptly repudiated by Ashbel Smith, Texan chargé d'affaires at London and Paris, who described his plan as an individual venture and not bearing the sanction of the government of Texas.[63] This terminated Andrews' active participation in such matters.

Upon his return to America he gained considerable repute as a pioneer in "phonetic transcription," known today as shorthand. Over 30 editions of his introductory course books and manuals of "phonography," written with the collaboration of Augustus F. Boyle, appeared between 1844 and 1849.[64] Included in the series were works on philology, phonetic printing and language teaching.[65]

---

[62] There is considerable biographical material of varied quality on Andrews. Older accounts, which tend to be somewhat fuller than the recent estimations, are in *Appleton's Cyclopedia,* I, 76, and *National Cyclopedia,* VI, 442-443. For others consult Kunitz and Haycraft, *American Authors,* 33; Charles T. Sprading, *Liberty and the Great Libertarians,* 236, and the article by Ernest Sutherland Bates and William Bristol Shaw in *Dictionary of American Biography,* I, 298-299.

[63] Jesse S. Reeves, *American Diplomacy Under Tyler and Polk* (Baltimore, 1907), 126.

It was during this time also that Andrews was impressed by economic unrest in the country, reflected by Fourierist socialism, the gropings of a labor movement, and a steady flow of radical writings on the currency problem. He began his participation by writing articles for the *Harbinger* and by the late 40's had become a convinced Fourierite. The meeting of the New England Labor Reform League in Boston in January, 1847 found Andrews taking part, along with other Fourierites, as one of the seven speakers heard during the convention.[66]

The return of Josiah Warren to Boston in 1848 signalled the end of Andrews' efforts on behalf of association and his attachment to the more radical teachings of native anarchism. Just when he decided that the political and economic approach of Warren was superior to that which he supported before meeting the proponent of equitable commerce is not exactly known. Yet, by the winter of 1850, he was lecturing before the New York Mechanic's Institute, presenting the individualist anarchist theories in a particularly well-conceived manner. The publication of Andrews' analysis of Warren's principles in 1852 under the general title *The Science of Society* was henceforth regarded by anarchists as the finest statement of Warrenism ever written.[67]

---

[64] Stephen P. Andrews, *The Phonographic Class Book* (Boston, 1844); Andrews and Augustus F. Boyle, *The Phonographic Reporter's First Book* (New York, 1848); Andrews and Boyle, *The Phonographic Word Book Number One* (New York, 1849); Andrews and Boyle, *The Phonographic Reader* (16 editions, Boston and New York, 1845-1850); Andrews and Boyle, *The Complete Phonographic Class Book* (11 editions, Boston and New York, 1845-1848).

[65] Stephen Pearl Andrews, *Memorial of the Inhabitants of the United States, Praying for the Printing of the Proceedings of Congress in Phonotypy* (Washington, 1850), (also published in *Senate Miscellaneous Documents,* 31 Cong., 1 Sess., Doc. 125); Andrews and George Batchelor, *A New and Comprehensive French Instructor* (New York, 1855); Andrews and Batchelor, *The Practical Pronouncer and Key to Andrews and Batchelor's New French Instructor* (New York, 1856); Andrews, *Discoveries in Chinese; or, the Symbolism of the Primitive Characters of the Chinese System of Writing* (New York, 1854). Andrews' interest in semantics and his own curious universal language were part of his sociological thinking and a product of the period after 1870.

[66] *Voice of Industry,* January 22, 1847, in Commons, *Documentary History,* VIII, 126. This group was an earlier affiliation of trade unions and sympathetic associates, and is not to be confused with the gatherings of the same name of a quarter century later.

Andrews later deprecated Fourierism, and pronounced it of little value, but it is probable that he never completely rejected its earlier teachings, which even found their way into his own sociology during the 70's.

[67] Andrews sent a pre-publication copy of his *Science of Society,* No. 1 to Lysander Spooner, apparently their first contact, judging from the formality of the reply. Spooner remarked, "I am obliged to you for your pamphlet, and have read it. It is very able, and I think the most of it is true. I go for individualism to the last extent, and I think the time may possibly come when the rights of the individual, and the law resulting from them, will be so well understood that little government will be necessary to protect

Andrews succeeded in transposing Warren's *Equitable Commerce* from a rough-hewn pioneer document into a smoothly finished statement, but took no credit for any original contribution of his own:[68]

> For the principles in question . . . the author confesses his great indebtedness . . . to the genius of Josiah Warren of Indiana, who has been engaged for more than twenty years in testing, almost in solitude . . . the principles which we are now for the first time presenting prominently to the public.

This was a fair assumption on Andrews' part, since the two Midwest editions of *Equitable Commerce* had enjoyed limited circulation. *The Science of Society* series faithfully presented the Warren principles on individual sovereignty,[69] free voluntary association and a cost basis economy.[70] Andrews declared they were immutable principles. Conformity to these simple rules produced harmony in the affairs of mankind, departure from them, confusion. "We teach them as science," he declared; "We do not ask that they shall be voted upon or applied under pledges." In the introduction to the second of the series, Andrews remarked upon the difficulty of explaining to people "beset by the fog of old ideas" a social reorganization without a social compact. "We do not bring forward a System, a Plan, or a Constitution, to be voted on, adopted, or agreed to, by mankind at large, or by any set of men whatsoever. . . . It is the evil of compacts that the compact becomes sacred and the individual profane."[71]

Andrews indicated from the nature of a number of criticisms a knowledge of some current allied activities and influences. The Garrisonian school of "no-government men" drew some expression of sympathy, although he considered their brand of "unterrified Democracy" theoretically consistent but practically illogical. Without economic reform in their desired social organization, degrading conditions would return and require violations of individual personal dignity once more. Reform was not synonymous with pure negation; if government was the source of societary disruption, it was necessary to introduce positive principles which would become the foundation of a stable society, otherwise, if temporarily replaced, government in the undesirable sense would soon return.[72]

---

the former from encroachment." He was not so taken with Josiah Warren's "cost-the-limit-of-price" theory, however; "I heard a lecture on the subject by Mr. Warren a few months ago, but it did not convince me." Spooner to Andrews, July 4, 1851, Baskette Collection. Andrews' two writings went into six editions, appearing each year from 1851-1854, and were revived by the Tuckerites in 1888 and again in 1895. A reprinting was featured in *Liberty* after his death. The 1888 edition was reissued in Boston in 1970.

[68] *Science of Society,* (No. 1), introd., v-vi.

[69] *Science of Society,* (No. 1), 21-26, 63-69.

[70] *Science of Society,* (No. 2), 196-201, 209-211.

[71] *Science of Society,* (No. 2), introd., vii-viii.

[72] *Science of Society,* (No. 1), 39.

Warren had refrained from specific mention of Fourierism in his first work. Andrews, on the other hand, declared the phalanx type of colonization "folly." He criticized Edward Kellogg and John Gray[73] for declaring one of the legitimate functions of money to be that of "measuring value." He also undertook a more extended defense of the Warrenite theory which regarded "natural increase" of production, the result of natural forces giving advantage to the element of time, as not subject to the economic designation of "price" unless labor had accompanied the process. Interest might be justified on the basis of the spontaneous creation of wealth by natural factors, but this was true of just a certain stage of production. All types of wealth tended to deteriorate, and required labor for protection and augmentation.[74]

Andrews' wrestling with the abstractions of Warrenite cost economy began to abate at about this time, but not before he succeeded in decoying Horace Greeley into a sociological controversy in the editorial columns of the New York *Tribune*.[75] The discussion, which eventually drew in Henry James, raged through most of April, 1853. Andrews admitted twisting the topic under discussion so as to bring Warren's ideas before a wider audience, but the character of some of the remarks indicated the extent of new influences. These were derived primarily from his wife, a doctor and an ardent suffragist, and Thomas and Mary S. Gove Nichols, pioneers of the "women's rights" movement[76] in the New York area.

The columns of the *Tribune* were utilized for three principal purposes; to denounce Greeley as a reactionary, to set forth the Warren-Andrews theory of social organization, and to open a new avenue of discussion in the matter of feminine equality. Andrews declared that those interested in reform were making a mistake in considering Greeley as a leader, for he was in reality a deeply conservative man. His espousal of Fourierism was superficial, and he had shown his real self by his sanction of respect for authority in economic matters, in political organization, and in the social relations of men and women. Andrews dwelt on Greeley's aversion for divorce and contrasted it with the growing tendency of self-expression on the part of an increasing minority of militant femininity.

---

[73] *Science of Society,* (No. 2), 113.

[74] Warren's doctrine of cooperation as explained by Andrews was very similar to Stirnerite egoism; "by co-operation . . . it meant such an arrangement of the property and industrial interests of the different Individuals of the community, that each, in pursuing his own pleasure or benefit, contributes incidentally to the pleasure or benefit of the others." *Science of Society,* (No. 2), 48.

[75] Andrews, *Love, Marriage and Divorce, and the Sovereignty of the Individual. A Discussion Between Henry James, Horace Greeley and Stephen Pearl Andrews,* 12-13. Hereinafter cited as *Discussion.* See also Charles Sotheran, *Horace Greeley and Other Pioneers of American Socialism* (New York, 1915), 12. Andrews had first contacted the *Tribune* on the matter in a reply to George Ripley, whose 3½ column review of the 1852 edition of Warren's *Equitable Commerce* had been published shortly before. His long answer to Ripley is reprinted in his *Science of Society* (1888 ed.), 153-165.

[76] Andrews' wife was Esther B. Hussey, a graduate of the New York Female Medical College. Her practice was confined to the city's poor and destitute for the greater part of her life. Like a great many of the professional and intellectual elements of the city in the 1850's, she was also a spiritualist. See her obituary by Frances Rose MacKinley in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly,* May 27, 1871.

Torn between his regard for Fourier, whom he praised as "about the most remarkable genius who has yet lived,"[77] and his new-found respect for Warren, the "Euclid of social science,"[78] Andrews set forth a defense of the latter's principles, with allusions to their functioning under actual living conditions at "Modern Times," over two years old at the time of writing. "It is something to be able to affirm," he wrote, "that there is at least one town in existence where women and children receive equal remuneration for their labor with men, not from benevolence, but upon a well-organized principle of justice, and by general concurrence, without pledges or constraint."[79]

Andrews believed that the real basic difference between Greeley and himself was bound up in their belief as to the fundamental theory of government. There were only two; the first, to which he claimed Greeley subscribed, declared that man was an irresponsible agent, not capable of governing himself and in need of another man to supply that function; the second, that man was potentially capable of governing himself.[80] The degree of failure to do so in practice merely indicated lack of practice. This should not be surrendered through the fear of evil consequences attending more failure, since it was something which man had to learn as he did learn other things. Of one thing Andrews was convinced, that the individual was entitled to the exercise of such self-government as avoided at all times encroachment upon all other persons. To him, the non-invasive individual was the unit of orderly society, and was entitled to immunity from coercion by institutions:[81]

> The most stupendous mistake that this world of ours has ever made is that of erecting an abstraction, the State, the Church, Public Morality, according to some accepted standard, . . . into a real personality, and making it paramount to the will and happiness of the individual.

He had embraced Warren's teachings without a consideration of their implications three or four years before. Andrews now displayed a realization of the root-and-branch anti-statism to which they logically pointed. The correspondence with Greeley and James contained the high-water mark of Andrews' anarchistic convictions, even though he would have

---

77. Andrews, *Discussion,* 8-9.
78. *Discussion,* 12.
79. *Discussion,* page cited above. He describes Warren as "an obscure, plain man, one of the people, a commonsense thinker."
80. *Discussion,* 9-11.
81. *Discussion,* 47.

rejected the appellation of "anarchist" had it been an expression in contemporary usage other than as a synonym for chaos. Few anarchists of succeeding generations ever wrote a categorical rejection of the coercive state in more emphatic terms than he during the exchanges with Horace Greeley:[82]

> Give up . . . the search after the remedy for the evils of government in more government. The road lies just the other way—toward individuality and freedom from all government. . . . It is the inherent viciousness of the very institution of government itself, never to be got rid of until our natural individuality of action and responsibility is restored. Nature made individuals, not nations; and while nations exist at all, the liberties of the individual must perish.

The invasion of anarchist "Modern Times" by the social philosophy of Auguste Comte and his first disciple in America, Henry Edger, has been already described.[83] Edger abandoned Warrenite individualism primarily to establish a cell of Comte's Religion of Humanity. The Comtean sociological concepts, on the other hand, succeeded in gradually weaning Stephen Pearl Andrews away from Warren and the Long Island band. The change took place in an unobtrusive, almost unconscious manner, yet by the late summer of 1857, the tenets of Positivism had become incorporated in his social thought. Henceforth his principal intellectual concern was that of sociological system-building. The attempt to fuse the diverse contributions of Fourier, Warren, and Comte into a grandiose eclectic social order of Pantarchy was under way. Anarchist thought, discussions and literature, previously concerned with political and economic considerations, now included a third element, ethics, with Andrews undertaking the torturous task of reconciling antithetical conceptions of the nature of human society. A thorough-going anarchist no longer, his relations with them continued for the remainder of his life in one situation or another.

Andrews began his comparison of Warren and Comte in Warren's own *Periodical Letter* of September, 1857.[84] At the same time, in an article in a New York spiritualist journal titled "Physiocracy, The New Order of Government,"[85] he revealed the influence of Comtean concepts and his defection from the ranks of the uncompromising Warren individualists. By now he had come to the conclusion that there were two main obstacles to complete dispensation of government: (1) the magnitude of interests in which human society was already involved; and (2) "the necessity for an authority vested somewhere to restrain encroachments and enforce obedience to commands." Such declarations were rank heresy when compared with his affirmations in his *Science of Society,* even though his proposed "physiocracy" contained a large element of voluntary association. Leadership in nature, said Andrews, was always vested in a single individual: "She never entrusts the business of governing to Committees and Boards." Thus direct responsibility and "unity of movement" were secured. It was his interpretation, furthermore, that obedience to leadership in nature was not obtained by compulsion but by "attraction," wherein it was a matter of greater agreeability to obey rather than to dissent. "Obedience to attraction, or the pursuit of the Agreeable, is the essence of Freedom," a manifestation of individual action fully free from constraint.[86] In this manner, he concluded, did nature effect the reconciliation of seemingly antagonistic principles. Until persuasion and changeability were substituted for coercion and permanence in human social systems, the efforts of "statesmen" would produce nothing of lasting importance:[87]

---

[82] *Discussion,* 64.

[83] Andrews' sociological speculations and their analogous position to those of Comte were recognized by several contemporaries. See for instance the account in Noyes, *American Socialisms,* 94, where Andrews is described as the American "rival" of Comte. For Edger, see Chapter III, part 2.

[84] *Periodical Letter,* I, 2nd Series (September, 1857), 85-89. This was later reprinted in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly* of June 3, 1871. For the 1938 reprinting by the Oriole Press consult Bibliography.

[85] *The Spiritual Age,* I (September 12, 1857), 77.

> Natural government is characterized by the absence of all organization which is not as natural and therefore as inevitable as crystallization; by the self-election, or spontaneous recognition of leaders, coupled with the continuous freedom of revolt on the part of the subject.

Thus the basic premises of a social scheme appeared, which was not fully developed for fifteen years. Andrews, no longer attached to the "Modern Times" community, was now living in New York in the company of a group of people connected more or less with the North American Phalanx,[88] a Fourierite colony in New Jersey.[89] Under his influence, a number of these people, mostly journalists, pooled resources and conducted for a time a coöperative residence in the city called the Unitary Home. The Home was operated under the management of Edward F. Underhill on Warren's cost price principle in the allocation of the economic burdens of operation. Andrews, now working on the basics of an universal language which he called "Alwato," lived there as did the poet Edmund Clarence Stedman.[90] Close by was DeGarmo Hall, where Andrews occasionally lectured on his gradually developing sociology.[91]

---

[86] There is still considerable evidence of the influence of Fourier in writing of this kind, especially the dwelling upon the idea of order in leadership through attraction.

[87] *Spiritual Age,* I, 77.

[88] Andrews was still sympathetic to this settlement, and spent some time there on occasions, despite the fact that he had deprecated Fourierite phalanx types of colonization as "folly." *Science of Society,* (No. 2), 178.

[89] Laura Stedman and George M. Gould, *Life and Letters of Edmund Clarence Stedman* (2 vols. New York, 1910), I, 153-154.

[90] Stedman and Gould, *Life and Letters,* I, 156-159, 176-177.

At the outbreak of the Civil War, Andrews abandoned his investigations for a time, his abolitionist background welling up while he asserted the righteousness of the cause of the North. Like Warren, the freedom of individuals was of greater importance to him than that of the Southern states. He paused long enough to indicate that the economic issue which had been growing during the pre-eminence of the slavery question in American affairs was by no means reconciled or dissolved:[92]

> The scientific and harmonious adjustment of the relations of capital to labor, of the employees to the employer . . . will still remain after Slavery is dead, . . . the next great practical question which will force itself upon our attention, and insist upon being definitively settled . . .

In the post-war period, Andrews became deeply involved in the movement for women's rights, his interests centering on social issues. This resulted in an intellectual alliance with the extremists under the nominal leadership of Victoria Woodhull. As an editorial partner in the publication of *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly,* he again made contact with the anarchists, primarily through attendance at the individualist-dominated conventions of the American and New England Labor Reform Leagues. His renewal of acquaintance with Warren after a meeting in New York in May, 1871 brought about a long hair-splitting controversy in the pages of the *Weekly* between the two over their sociological differences. Andrews now had placed most of his pantarchal system in manuscript form or in published articles in periodicals. The main point of the dispute between the two centered about the interpretation of the words "right" and "duty." Warren, adhering to his basic views, insisted that in a world of free contract, there was no such thing as duty, only rights. A person able to live by uncoerced voluntary contract, he declared, did things not because he felt under obligation to do so but because it was to his best interests. In non-compulsive situations, Warren believed that no one would enter into agreements, contracts, or commitments which tended to operate to his disadvantage. Thus, what appeared to be compliance with a conscientious feeling of obligation to act in a certain way would actually be the fulfillment of one's side of a particular social arrangement, through recognition of the advancement of one's personal interests or fortunes by so doing, and therefore hardly worthy of designation as "duty."[93]

---

[91] Andrews' group organized a meeting place known as The Club which during the period 1854-1855 was located at 555 Broadway, where "men, women and children gathered once a week at a cost of 10 cents each, to amuse themselves and each other socially and rationally, instead of resorting to lager-beer saloons and the theatres, or more objectionable places." Known to the general public as the "Free-Love Club," its members were occasionally harassed, as Andrews was to describe, by "the brute instincts of an ignorant populace." *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly,* June 10, 1871.

The Labadie Collection contains a brochure intended to advertise one of these lectures at the hall, at Fifth Avenue and Fourteenth Street, announcing "A Scientific Sermon by Stephen Pearl Andrews, in Exposition of Universology, Integralism and the Pantarchal Regime, as the Commonwealth or Universal Institute of Humanity; and of the general scope of the Science, with some appropriate Literary and Religious Exercises illustrative of the purposes of THE NEW CATHOLIC CHURCH." Capitalization is reproduced from the brochure.

[92] Andrews, "The Great American Crisis," in *The Continental Monthly,* V (March, 1864), 314.

Andrews, now admittedly trying to present a synthesis of the Warrenite and Comtean schools of social science, said that there were separate categories of duties and rights, and that it was not proper for the two groups, the individualists and the positivists, to maintain that it was a matter entirely of either rights, as did Warren, or all duties, as did the followers of Comte. Andrews at this time admitted that he had never rejected Fourierism even though he apparently had been a convinced follower of the anarchist beliefs of Warren.[94] This contradictory position did not indicate or imply that he had rejected the principles of sovereignty of the individual and cost as the limit of price. It was the matter of difficulty in getting them adopted. "The real objections" to these, he explained, "are that men cannot and will not accept and apply such purely abstract principles," even though they were "a very precious element in every true organization." For having expressed them, and for trying to put them into practical operation, Andrews concluded, "Mr. Warren will and should forever rank as one of the first Sociologists, although his principles may find themselves practically vindicated under forms of society very different from . . . what he has in idea."[95]

Whether society is an organism in which individuals play certain parts on the basis of established rules and relationships, or whether society is a collection of individuals and reflects the quality and attainment of individuals, has not yet been satisfactorily thrashed out, despite current trends. This controversial matter was being then discussed also. Andrews, in his *Basic Outline of Universology,* published in 1872, sought to reconcile Warren's stand of society as merely the byproduct of the actions of separate individual sovereigns with the organic view of Comte and Fourier.[96] Between Warren and Comte, he considered the former's approach the "scientific," Comte's "metaphysical and philosophical," and the issue a matter of "Individualism" against "Subordination."[97] Fourier he considered the pioneer in attempting to reconcile the two, and "association by attraction" appears prominently in the Andrews program of "Integralism." The problem of the individual and his relation to "society," elaborated on by Andrews in *Universology,* can be associated with his part in the propaganda of anti-statism in the period prior to the Civil War. Nor can he be dismissed from consideration as an American sociologist.[98] But the book itself is a painful demonstration of writing, loaded with neologisms and obscurantist techniques.

---

[93] *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly,* June 3, June 10, July 15, August 5, August 19, September 2, 1871.

[94] Andrews' inconsistency in this matter was evident a few years later in the following dismissal of his first master: "Fourier's scheme had not one word even in relation to the direct improvement of the individual. It was a grand machine for grinding out an improved humanity from an improved mill of conditions. And just here it failed." *The Word,* II (March, 1874), 3.

[95] *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly,* September 2, 1871.

[96] This book was sold to private subscribers, being subsidized by a friend of Andrews, Mrs. Elizabeth Thompson. Subscribers included David Dudley Field, Peter Cooper, Edward L. Youmans, John Swinton and former Vice President Benjamin F. Wade. *Universology,* 756; John T. Trowbridge, "Reminiscence of the Pantarch," in *The Independent,* LV, 499.

As close associate of Mrs. Woodhull, he played a prominent part in the sensational "exposure" of Henry Ward Beecher in 1873. He had known Beecher over a score of years previous.[99] The conflict between Andrews and Henry James was re-opened[100] at this same time, as the result of the violent disturbance being created by the "free love" propaganda campaign of the Woodhull-Andrews group in New York City. Andrews' attack on state interference with marriage was regarded as an endorsement of unbridled license,[101] and for many years he was suspected of operating a "school for wayward wives," the women associated with the Woodhull campaign being reputed for their outspoken and individualistic behavior, as well as their lack of respect for male superiority pretensions.

A renewed interest in the economic ideas of Proudhon and Warren took place after the death of the latter, in which Greene, Heywood,

---

[97] Mr. Warren indeed admits the Counter-principle of Leadership, or Individuality of Lead, . . . but he makes so little of it in the comparison with the Divergent or *liberating* operation of Individuality, that his name may well be put as the representative *"par excellence"* of his profoundly Radical Principle of Socialism.

Comte, on the other hand, with no attempt even at any adequate discrimination, leans, by his natural attitudes, wholly to the opposite extreme. He explicitly denies Rights to the Individual in Society, altogether. He affirms that Society alone has Rights, and the Individual has Duties to perform, only. . . . The Collective Interests of Humanity, and the absolute devotion of the Individual to them, is insisted upon in such immense preponderance, that I have chosen his name to stand representatively for this Counter-Principle of Convergent Individuality. *Universology,* 31-32. Stress and capitals quoted from original text.

[98] For the failure of such sociologists as Lester Ward and Charles Cooley to specifically mention the sources of their ideas, and the probability of heavy borrowing from Andrews, among others, see Luther L. and Jessie Bernard, *Origins of American Sociology: The Social Science Movement in the United States,* 838-840. For further analysis of Warren, consult *Universology,* 30, 485.

[99] See article in *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly,* February 8, 1873 relating early associations of the two men.

Beecher, a notable opponent of Mrs. Woodhull, whom he accused of moral turpitude, was met on his own ground by a widely-broadcast accusation of improper relations with the wife of Theodore Tilton, a prominent parishioner of the well-known clergyman. Beecher's moral campaign against the Woodhull group declined sharply a short while thereafter.

[100] *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly,* April 18, May 9, May 16, 1874.

[101] *Discussion,* 108, 112.

Linton and Tucker led the way. Andrews' contacts with this circle revealed another holdover among his ideas.[102] His article "The Labor Dollar" in Tucker's *Radical Review* revealed his continued attachment to Warren's views on money.[103] He admitted that both had failed in devising a self-regulating system of currency and banking based directly on labor, their chief objective.

A day's work of eight hours rather than a single hour should constitute the "labor dollar," was Andrews' reconsidered judgment. To be accurate, it must represent two other factors, degree of intensity or severity, and acquired skill. He believed that in the matter of intensity, an assumed average was still the best approach, approximately what Warren's corn labor note had purported to do.[104] By adjusting this assumed average constantly, as the group at "Utopia" had done, the true average intensity would be reached. Thus, for instance, the eight hour day of average intensity would tend to be estimated in greater production per hour, as skill and ability in that particular occupation became increasingly attracted to it. With the establishment of complete freedom of access to occupations, the tendency would be for those who produced the most in the shortest amount of time in each productive job to become well known:[105]

> This change will enable them to know far better than they now know what labors they really like best, and are willing to do at the cheapest rate. There will then grow up a legitimate labor market, and all kinds of labor and products will be tendered at the minimum price as measured by the average estimate of the degree of severity of the labor involved in them.

In most other respects, Andrews deviated little from what he had written a quarter century before. Acquired skill was considered an element of labor cost, while superior natural ability was not.[106] The immense difficulty of separating the two attributes Andrews passed over.

---

[102] *The Index,* VII, 291, 333, 375-376, 429. A review by Andrews of Tucker's translation of *What Is Property? An Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government,* the famous and highly controversial anarchist work of Proudhon, brought about most of the argument. For Warren's last days in the movement, see *The Word,* II (January, 1874), 2; *The Index,* V, 198-199, 260-261.

[103] This was first printed in the August, 1877 issue of the *Radical Review,* and subsequently published as a pamphlet in 1881. Page citations are from the first printing.

[104] *Radical Review,* I, 294-295.

[105] *Radical Review,* I, 297.

[106] ". . . equity, in establishing prices, grants nothing on the ground of natural superiority, therein concurring with the principles of fair dealing, . . . it will be found that the effect is quietly to force everybody into their true places; . . . Under the principle the best endowed and most efficient labor comes into competition with inferior labor in each special branch, not, as now, at a higher price, but absolutely at a lower price. He who should have the greatest natural fitness for a particular kind of work, having greater facility in it, will—with some exceptions only—have also the greatest attraction or

The outbreak of the railroad strike in 1877 brought mixed reactions from Andrews; the coming to grips of labor and capital which he and Warren had predicted thirty years before was undoubtedly at hand. "There is a new order of things here now, or inevitably about to come," he intoned. A social or "industrial" revolution, involving "the whole laboring population," was about to take place; "A ready acceptance of the situation on the part of the rich and the great" alone would prevent grave irregularities, as "the theory of shooting them down is futile."

Andrews displayed the distance which he had strayed from his anarchist views of an earlier time, however, by the nature of the reforms he expected the strikers to propose and obtain:[107]

> . . . the forced transfer of all railroads, magnetic telegraphs, and great public works to the government, with the laborers paid fixed and equitable prices, as government employes; the organization of great government work shops, or organized government colonization, or other similar enterprises, and the honest effort that government shall become the social providence of all the people.

No social program involved any greater stress on active interference by state action. Others of the Warren group expressed the most warm sympathies with the strikers, but none exhibited this degree of contradiction as compared to previous theoretical stands.

The passion among fragments of reform elements for the organization of "leagues" of various sorts resulted in the agglomeration known as the Union Reform League, a Heywood-Andrews directed association of small groups interested in various social reforms. The U. R. L., the principal aim of which was the "blending of all shades of opinion, and the union of all Schools of Reform in one common platform," met annually in Heywood's home town of Princeton, Mass. from 1879 until 1882. The American and New England Labor Reform Leagues had been primarily engaged in propagation of economic reform sentiment. The new group included elements concerned with temperance, freethought, woman suffrage, spiritualism, currency reform and trade unionism. Andrews became nominal president of the U. R. L. at its second meeting, at which time it probably reached the peak of its interest to a wide gathering of allied sympathizers.[108]

---

fondness for that kind of industry. His estimate of its intensity will therefore be less than that of other men . . . it will not be as hard work for him as for them, and, therefore, his price will be less, . . . so that to be driven out of the labor market only means being transferred to something better." *Radical Review,* I, 305-307.

[107] *The Index,* VIII, 377.

[108] A report of these conventions, with extended attention to details, is that by Ezra Heywood, *The Evolutionists: Being a Condensed Report of the Principles, Purposes and Methods of the Union Reform League.* For lists of speakers, distinguished visitors and interested correspondents involved in the three conventions see *work cited above,* 3-8.

Most of the anarchists had by now drawn away from both Heywood and Andrews and had gathered around Tucker with the express purpose of concentrating on exposing economic evils. The resolutions of the U. R. L. nevertheless still reflected a strong anti-statist flavor. The 1881 convention adopted unanimously the following "practical measures of Reform": woman suffrage, repeal of the obscenity statutes, repeal of laws making bible reading compulsory in the public schools, the adoption of a "new cosmopolitan language," abolition of poll tax qualifications for voting, repeal of the license and prohibitory liquor laws, repeal of laws "taxing citizens to support war, or compelling them to do military service," abolition of land, money and transportation monopolies,[109] and an endorsement of free trade. The negative nature of most of these reforms reveal the heavy anarchist influence. The Union Reform League dissolved in 1882, and its parts drifted into new reform orbits.

Andrews, still active in New York,[110] continued his sociological speculations. His dissertations before the Liberal Club received considerable publicity, since he had now become reputed for his vast learning. His prophecy of the future envisioned a single governmental unit for the world at the end of the twenty-first century, with a single world language and religious creed. This was to follow a political conflict on ideological grounds[111] between "plutocracy," the government of rich men exemplified by "the laissez-faire doctrine of the political economists, Herbert Spencer included," and the "politarchy" of state socialism. These two compulsory forms of the "governmental idea" he saw eventually giving way before the anarchist principle, "which simply strives to throw off all governmental control, to relegate the management of all human affairs to the pure, unorganized, unregulated spontaneity of the people themselves."[112] This simplified result strongly resembled the Andrews governmental ideal of "convergent individuality," which was an amalgamation of the free association of the anarchist and the free recognition of the leadership function as derived from Charles Fourier.

Against the twentieth century backdrop of titanic struggles between great centralized states, such prognostications have a flavor of visionary romanticism bearing little relation to reality. The position of Stephen Pearl Andrews in American sociology[113] is no settled matter. The fact that the nature of much of his thought and erudition is apart from his contributions as a social thinker has made an evaluation difficult.[114] The consideration at this time is with his relation to the development of American anarchism, from which he did deviate while remaining deeply attached to its basic principle of personal freedom. The American anarchist Henry Appleton declared him to be "the intellectual giant of America." The English anarchist Henry Seymour said he was "probably the most intellectual man on this planet." Benjamin Tucker's estimate, probably the soundest, was: "Anarchists especially will ever remember and honor him because he has left behind him the ablest English book ever written in defense of Anarchist principles."[115] That Tucker's followers were to claim substantially the same for him at a later time illustrates the continuity of intellectual content in the American anarchist movement.

---

[109] Prison reform, "theological reform," and an anti-vaccination plank also occupied discussion and approval at this time. Heywood, *The Evolutionists,* 8, 14-15.

[110] See Tucker's comment concerning Andrews' recent reproach of the plumb-line anarchists for their "dread of order" in *Liberty,* I (October, 1881), 1.

[111] New York *Home Journal,* August 20, 1884. For Andrews' universal language, and his investigations into the meaning of words, see his following works: *Primary Grammar of Alwato* (New York, 1877); *Primary Synopsis of Universology and Alwato* (New York, 1877); *The Alphabet of Philosophy* (New York, 1881); *Ideological Etymology; or a New Method in the Study of Words* (New York, 1881); *The One Alphabet for the Whole World* (New York, 1881).

[112] *Truth,* I (June, 1884), 42-44. It is interesting to note that Andrews compared Lester Ward to Comte in evaluating their contributions to social thinking, he himself having been the object of comparison to the French sociologist by John Humphrey Noyes fifteen years earlier.

---

[113] See especially Luther and Jessie Bernard, *Origins of American Sociology,* Chapters XII, XXII, XXIII.

[114] "Observer," in the Boston *News,* spoke of him as "an iceberg of a brain," "as remarkable an heresiarch as Brigham Young, and has doubtless been more mischievous." Trowbridge, a personal acquaintance, recalled him as "a type of pure intellect . . . but a colossal egotist and sterile pedant." *The Word,* IV (May, 1875), 1; Trowbridge, "Reminiscence of the Pantarch," 497.

[115] *The Anarchist,* I (June, 1885), 2; I (August, 1886), 1; *Liberty,* III (June 19, 1886), 2.

CHAPTER VII

Lysander Spooner, Dissident Among Dissidents

I

The economic and social concepts which formed the basis of American anarchist thought were first stated by Josiah Warren. Most of the significant contributions of others, especially of an economic nature, were made by men with varying degrees of relationship to Warren. There was one important exception, Lysander Spooner, an independent radical whose political and economic writings paralleled those of the better-known group for many years. Regardless of the use made of his works, Spooner remained apart from the individualists except for brief instances of association during his later life, when his most powerful tracts in support of anarchist principles were written. By the 1880's however, his works were being widely read by the native anti-statists.

The career of Spooner is that of a man whose radicalism increased rather than decreased with advancing age. He was born January 19, 1808, in Athol, Massachusetts.[1] The early part of his life was spent on his father's farm, which he left at the age of 25 to become a clerk in the office of the registry of deeds in Worcester. He began the study of law shortly thereafter under John Davis and Charles A. Allen, jurists of considerable esteem in the state. Finding the practice of law closed to him by a statute which required three years of additional study on the part of non-college-trained bar candidates, he conducted a campaign which secured the repeal of the statute.

Spooner's first seven years as a lawyer were spent in Ohio[2] rather than in Massachusetts, however, during which time he participated in

---

1. Brief biographical data can be located in *Dictionary of American Biography,* XVII, 466-467, and *Appleton's Cyclopedia,* V, 634-635. See also the entry in Sprading, *Great Libertarians,* 258, and *Liberty,* IV (May 28, 1887), 4-5. Tucker's six column obituary notice is a short biography in itself, incorporating much material which appears in no other work. Tucker, as the executor of Spooner's literary effects, had access to valuable documentary items and unpublished manuscripts, all of which were destroyed by fire in 1908.
2. While living in Ohio, Spooner collaborated with another lawyer, Noah H. Swayne, in an attempt to prevent the state board of public works from "draining" the Maumee River. See *Spooner vs McConnell et al. An Argument Presented to the United States Circuit Court in Support of a Petition for an Injunction to Restrain Alexander McConnell and Others from Placing Dams in the Maumee River, Ohio* (n.p., 1839); *Liberty,* IV (June 18, 1887), 8.

the rapidly spreading freethought campaign. His *The Deist's Reply to the Alleged Supernatural Evidences of Christianity* became one of the better known pamphlets against religious orthodoxy.[3] Its general tone gave an indication of his later disdain for constituted authority other than the church.[4]

The career of Spooner the jurist is far less important than that of Spooner the critic of the Constitution and legislative processes. His criticisms were both economic and political in nature. The two overlapped, and often came from his pen alternately, so that no clear separation can be observed. He regarded the Constitution primarily as a device which afforded opportunities to minority groups to exploit others through the instrument of special privileges. The opportunity might accrue to private citizens, or to a small group within the government at any particular time, but to him the important fact lay in the manipulation of the "fundamental law of the land" to the benefit of financial, commercial, and landed interests, and to select politicians.[5]

Where Spooner derived his interest in finance is not known. The 1837 panic undoubtedly was foremost among the sources. The principal impression he derived from the political controversy it produced was not the contest of personalities involved, but rather the nature of banking by private corporations and the increasing complication resulting from the activities of political and governmental bodies. To those interested in keeping credit open to competition and private pursuit, he issued a warning that a maze of artificial restrictions and legal escape-mechanisms was in the early stages of construction. Such was the message of his *Constitutional Law Relative to Credit, Currency and Banking* (1843), portions of which were still being incorporated in the free banking literature of the anarchist press a half century later.

"To issue bills of credit, that is, promissory notes, is a natural right. . . . The right of banking, or of contracting debts by giving promissory notes for the payment of money is as much a natural right as that of manufacturing cotton."[6] Such was Spooner's premise in opening his attack upon the contention that state charters should be required to engage in the banking business. Banking was either a totally reprehensible activity and should be entirely suppressed, or all pretense at protection of the citizenry should be abandoned and the enterprise opened to all who wished to enter it. Spooner saw no escape from the logical conclusion that the intrusion of the federal government into matters of legal tender, bank chartering, and incorporation was based upon expediency.

---

[3] Albert Post, *Popular Freethought in America, 1825-1850,* p. 288. Spooner authored a similar treatise which appeared two years earlier. *The Deist's Immortality and an Essay on Man's Accountability for His Belief* (Boston, 1834).

[4] Said Spooner, "All men of common sense disregard authority." *Deist's Reply,* 41. *The Deist's Reply* was run serially in Underhill's *Cleveland Liberalist* during part of 1836. Post, *Popular Freethought,* 63.

[5] Spooner did not believe that the Constitution was a class document; his earlier criticisms centered around its interpretation to the advantage of one element of the populace or another. After the Civil War, his attacks bore directly upon the very authority of the Constitution, and grew in audacity and antagonism.

[6] Spooner, *Constitutional Law Relative to . . . Banking,* 24.

Spooner assumed that the constitutional clause forbidding the impairment of the obligation of contracts was an acknowledgement of the natural right of men to make contracts.[7] There was no doubt in his mind that creation of compulsory legal tender and granting of bank charters were direct infringements of contracts. The making of a contract, he said, was an "act of real persons," and was of necessity restricted to persons, for there were no others who could do so. Therefore, he declared,[8]

> The idea . . . of a joint, incorporeal being, made up of several real persons, is nothing but a fiction. It has no reality in it. It is a fiction adopted merely to get rid of the consequences of facts. An act of legislation cannot transform twenty living, real persons into one joint, incorporeal being. After all the legislative juggling that can be devised, "the company" will still be nothing more, less or other, than the individuals composing the company. The idea of an incorporeal being, capable of carrying on banking operations, is ridiculous.

The impact of such incorporation? Spooner said it freed men of contractual obligations as individuals. When profits accrued from banking operations, the stockholders in whose names the chartering had taken place appeared as individuals to collect; yet, the cloak of anonymity was there to protect them as individuals in the case of losses. Escape through the provision of a collective personality was at hand, when liability for their contracts, beyond their ability or desire to meet as individuals, presented itself to the banking company. Thus a hypothetical financial firm with total capital of $50,000 might signify its intention to enter the business of banking to the extent of $10,000, issue the sum of $40,000 in unconditional promises to pay, and then default on this latter sum, losing only the original amount which they intended to risk. The desire to limit the extent of promises either of companies or of individuals should be expressed in the contracts themselves, not in limited liability by law, for if law lessened the responsibility expressed in the contract, it impaired the obligation thereof.[9] It was impossible to regard bank charters as anything else than artifices giving to certain individuals

---

[7] "It is obvious that all these arguments in favor of laws controlling the obligation of contracts are urged almost entirely by men who have been in the habit of regarding the legislative authority as being nearly absolute - and who cannot realize the idea that 'the people' of this nation . . . should ordain it that their natural right to contract with each other, and 'the obligations of contracts' when made, should not be subjects of legislative caprice or discretion." *Constitutional Law Relative to . . . Banking,* 16.

[8] *Constitutional Law Relative to . . . Banking,* 20.

[9] *Constitutional Law Relative to . . . Banking,* 21.

"the advantage of two legal natures,—one favorable for making contracts, the other favorable for avoiding the responsibility of them."[10]

Thus Spooner laid the cause of the evils in the banking business of his time squarely on the doorsteps of the legislatures. In later writings he was to go into great detail on the part played by the national government in placing the country's banks in the hands of a minority group. Meanwhile, a personal encounter with the federal government itself occupied his attention. From 1841 to 1845, steady inroads on the revenues of the federal post office department were made by private express companies. One of these was the American Letter Mail Company, which Spooner founded in 1844. Originally carrying letters between Boston and New York, the scope of the firm soon included Philadelphia and Baltimore.[11] It was a source of embarrassment to the Democratic administrations of the period to see this company, as well as other letter mail companies, making profits from carrying letters for 5 and 10 cents each, while providing service somewhat more expeditious than that furnished by the federal postal system. Increasing complaint by patrons over the dilatory and expensive government operations finally provoked congressional action. A bill calling for reorganization of the post office system and proposing a new schedule of rates drew critical fire in the Senate from objectors who noted that private companies would still be furnishing cheaper service. Senator William D. Merrick of Maryland, sponsor of the bill,[12] replied that there was to be no attempt at competing with these firms; they were to be put out of business by "penal enactment."[13]

Again Spooner went to the Constitution for support of his thesis that the passage of such legislation would be a clear transcendance of the authority granted Congress. Article 1, Section 8 merely provided that Congress might establish post offices and post roads of its own. Said he: "The Constitution expresses, neither in terms, nor by necessary implication, any prohibition upon the establishment of mails, post offices, and post roads by the states or individuals."[14] Had Congress been granted the power to establish stage coaches and steamboats, this act would not have conferred exclusive rights to the operation and establishment of all stage coach and steamboat lines. The power to establish and the power to prohibit were distinct powers, and in the case of additional mail services Congress distinctly did not have the power to prohibit.[15]

---

[10] *Constitutional Law Relative to . . . Banking,* page cited above.

[11] *Liberty,* IV (May 28, 1887), 4.

[12] S. 51; for text see *Congressional Globe,* 28 Cong., 1 Sess., XIII, 431-432. Sections 10-14 provided for the outlawing of the private mail companies. The arguments on the part of proponents of the bill did not concern the issue of revenues, but of furnishing a "great governmental instrument of service," and heavy subsidization was expected to equalize heavy deficit operational expenses anticipated. There was no stress on its political significance as far as a source of sympathetic supporters at election times, while it was brought out that in most areas the postmasterships were not attractive financially.

[13] Remarks by Merrick in *Congressional Globe,* 28 Cong., 2 Sess., XIV, 206.

[14] Spooner, *The Unconstitutionality of the Laws of Congress Prohibiting Private Mails,* 5.

Spooner also asserted that the establishment of a government monopoly over the mails, followed by the exclusion therefrom of such materials as it cared, was actually an infringement upon the freedom of the press. This latter meant not merely the freedom of printing papers and books but the freedom of selling and circulating them as well. This was a very important point, for without the latter, the former was of no value at all. Therefore this selling and circulating freedom implied the right of publishers to reach buyers in any manner they chose.[16] Should the government be the sole carrier, it might ban the publications it did not approve of.

There were other considerations. Besides the social and commercial objections of slowness and costliness, Spooner advanced a moral objection to an exclusive national system. "Its immense patronage and power, used, as they always will be, corruptly, make it also a very great political evil." Competition in this pursuit would provide a reduction both in costs and time spent in delivery as well as "the political benefits of a very material purification of the government."[17]

The circulation of these ideas in a small booklet failed to be of any avail in the struggle against the government, however, and the independent companies were virtually eliminated in 1845 by a congressional act providing stiff fines for the carrying of mails by other than the government postal system. Spooner finally liquidated his own firm after exhausting his resources fighting the government over a seven month period.[18] The gradual adoption of a rate of postage similar to that charged by his company nevertheless gave him a measure of personal satisfaction.[19] Thus ended his one experience as a businessman. He had

---

15. *Private Mails,* 19, 22.
16. *Private Mails,* 16. He asserted that the concept of "freedom of speech" included the freedom of transmission of manuscript correspondence.
17. "Government functionaries, secure in the enjoyment of warm nests, large salaries, official honors and power, and presidential smiles—all of which they are sure of so long as they are partisans of the President—feel few quickening impulses to labor, and are altogether too independent and dignified personages to move at the speed that commercial interests require. They take office to enjoy its honors and emoluments, not to get their living by the sweat of their brows. . . . The consequence is, as we now see, that a cumbrous, clumsy, expensive and dilatory government system is once established, it is nearly impossible to modify or materially improve it. Opening the business to rivalry and free competition is the only way to get rid of the nuisance." *Private Mails,* 24.
18. *Liberty,* IV (May 28, 1887), 5. Fifty years after its publication, Spooner's pamphlet attacking the restriction of the private mail companies was still being sold to the readers of *Liberty,* along with 21 of his other publications. *Liberty,* X (May 19, 1894), 12.
19. In a letter to Stephen Pearl Andrews, Spooner expressed disappointment that editors such as Horace Greeley downgraded Spooner's private mail company and tried to minimize his influence. "The latter may think it was

sought to expose the wastefulness of government operation, a perennial anarchist charge, while at the same time attempting to demonstrate the merits of completely free competition. This was good anarchist economics.

Up to this time Spooner had hardly begun his work as an economic pamphleteer. Primarily concerned with money, banking and credit, he later grew to be regarded by the anarchists as on a par with Greene as an advocate of free banking. Like Greene, he stressed the monetization of durable wealth other than specie and the opening of the business of banking to all who wished to enter it.

In 1846 Spooner published another essay indicting political interference with free processes and accusing the judiciary of gross dereliction in permitting widespread violations of the laws of contracts and the principles of natural law. His *Poverty: Its Illegal Causes and Legal Cure* set forth his basic beliefs with respect to the relation between men and the production of wealth, and the reasons for the lack of harmony in these relations. The "economical propositions"[20] he set forth to establish hinged on the proposition that it was a principle of natural law that every man was entitled to "all the fruits of his own labor."[21] That this might be feasible, it was necessary that every man be his own employer or work for himself in a direct way, since working for another resulted in a portion being diverted to the employer. To be one's own employer, it was necessary for one to have access to one's own capital or to be allowed to obtain it on credit. This postulated the presence of men with surplus capital to loan, and a rate of interest sufficient to induce them to do so. It was to the interest of the potential self-employed laborer, however, to seek capital at the lowest possible rate of interest, and that required that free banking be allowed, implying, as a result, the monetization of many types of wealth:[22]

> As the materials for banking credit are abundant, . . . it is obvious that if free competition in banking were allowed, the rate of interest would be brought very low, and bank loans would be within the reach of every-

---

their editorials that caused the reduction," Spooner commented, "But I affected the debates in Congress, and the votes in 1843, 1844, and 1845 show that something besides editorials, or the example of English postage, caused the disturbance in Congress, and *forced* them (for they acknowledged themselves forced), to a reduction." Spooner to Andrews, July 4, 1851, Baskette Collection. See also Spooner, *Who Caused the Reduction in Postage?* (Boston, 1851). Tucker called him "the father of cheap postage in America." Spooner has come in for recognition in a recent popularized treatment of the early days of the federal postal system; see Ernest A. Kehn, Henry M. Goodkind, and Elliott Perry, "Look Before You Lick," in *Readers Digest*, L (June, 1947), 125-127. A recent evaluation sympathetic to the private companies is Frank Chodorov, *The Myth of the Post Office* (Hinsdale, Ill., 1948).

[20] Spooner, *Poverty*, 8, 23.

[21] *Poverty*, 7-8.

[22] *Poverty*, 15.

body whose business and character should make him a reasonably safe person to loan to.

This could not be, said Spooner, because of two judicial dicta upholding "arbitrary and unconstitutional" statutes, providing for the legalization of the banking business by the state and fixing the rate of interest, the so-called "usury laws." The first placed the granting of credit into the hands of a few, the second restricted the recipients of credit in a similar manner. It was not possible to determine an arbitrary rate of interest and expect it to operate to the best advantage of the less fortunate. Interest rates depended upon the character of the security tendered the "capitalist" in payment for the loan. The greater the degree of risk involved, the higher would be the rate of interest charged. But the standardization of a fixed rate of interest served to tie this rate of interest to the most approved security,[24] and those unable to tender this approved security obtained no credit. The result? A violation of the right to make contracts, and the granting of a monopoly of the right of borrowing money to those few able to present the type of security deemed safest.[24] It was a pernicious statute, warned Spooner, which allowed one man to borrow enough capital to employ a hundred laborers, but which forbade the individual laborers the facility of borrowing enough to employ themselves independently.[25]

From such materials was fashioned the industrial system, as well. The collection of scattered loanable capital under the control of single bank directories, and its subsequent loan to a few individuals in large sums, brought about the familiar hiring pattern, with "compulsory" selling of one's labor to the privileged employer.[26] Thus the usury laws, on first glance a protection of the less fortunate from exorbitant rates of interest, but actually operating to keep them from achieving economic independence in self-employment and placing them at the mercy of a favored employing group.[27]

The legal structure of debts and the way they were incurred was condemned as the other chief cause of poverty. Here again legal construction was responsible. Spooner declared that a debt had no legal obligation, and usually no moral one, beyond the means and ability of the debtor to pay at the time the debt became due. If this principle were adopted, it would put to an end an entire class of contracts, which, he

---

23. *Poverty,* 8-9.
24. *Poverty,* 9-10.
25. "Of all the frauds by which labor is cheated out of its earnings by legislation . . . probably no one is more purely tyrannical or more destructive . . . than that monopoly of the right to borrow money." *Poverty,* 12-13.
26. *Poverty,* 15-16.
27. ". . . almost all fortunes are made out of the capital and labor of other men than those who realize them. Indeed, large fortunes could rarely be made at all by one individual, except by his sponging capital and labor from others. And the usury laws are the means by which he does it." *Poverty,* 11.

said were "fraudulent and immoral" from the beginning. "The law requires no impossibilities from any man," he explained. "If a man contract to perform what proves to be an impossibility, the contract is valid only for so much as is possible," and thus to insist on the fulfillment of a manifest impossibility was absurd.[28] Freedom to contract for any interest rates would give creditors an opportunity to insure against the possibilities of non-payment in full by charging extra interest, almost in the nature of an insurance premium against default. This was not permitted, but the courts allowed creditors to harass the debtors indefinitely until the amount originally due was obtained. This process merely created another "class tension" within society without enhancing the creditor's chance of getting paid.[29] Furthermore, as things stood, the legal structure actually was providing a type of special protection not afforded the remainder of the community. It was the responsibility of the creditor to judge for himself the capacity of the debtor before taking the risk of entrusting property to him. To grant the former permission to indefinitely pursue until satisfaction had been received, amounted, in Spooner's opinion, to protection "against the legitimate consequence of his own negligence." Mutual benefit was the only foundation for entry into contracts; at least the particular contract in question "should contemplate no injury to either party." Therefore, if the debtor had "faithfully exercised his best ability for its preservation," the binding nature of this and all similar contracts was at an end when it reached the limit of the debtor's means.[30]

Extremes of wealth brought about by "positive legislation" also underlay most crimes against property and provided the foundation for fraud and vice in general. The tendency for society to separate into "castes" on the basis of their unequal wealth brought about most of society's diseases. What was the influence of reform?[31]

> Legislatures, courts, prisons, churches, schools, and moral associations of all sorts are sustained at an immense cost of time, labor, talent, and money. Yet they only mitigate, they do not cure the disease. And like all efforts to cure diseases, without removing the cause, they must always be inadequate to the end in view. The causes of vice, fraud, crime, excessive wealth and excessive poverty, must be removed, before society can be greatly changed.

While Spooner pointed out the infringement by statute law on the right of contract, he had no formula to offer as a solution, nor any recommendation to make along positive lines. "Each man has the natural right to acquire all he honestly can, and to enjoy and dispose of all that he honestly acquires; and the protection of these rights is all that anyone has a right to ask of government in relation to them."[32] This was his only concession to state interference with the economic life of the people, that each person's rights might be consistent with the equal rights of all the others. A government interfering with this formula of natural right, as they had in the matter of contracts, did so for the benefit of some at the expense of others, and in this class of action he placed nearly all statute law applying to men's "pecuniary interests":[33]

---

[28] *Poverty,* 65-67.
[29] *Poverty,* 18-19, 46-47.
[30] *Poverty,* 22, 73.
[31] *Poverty,* 54.

> Nearly all the positive legislation that has ever been passed in this country, either on the part of the general or state governments, touching men's rights to labor, or their rights to the fruits of their labor, . . . has been merely an attempt to substitute arbitrary for natural laws; to abolish men's natural rights of labor, property, and contract, and in their place establish monopolies and privileges; to create extremes in both wealth and poverty; to obliterate the eternal laws of justice and right and set up the naked will of avarice and power; in short, to rob one portion of mankind of their labor, or the fruits of their labor, and give the plunder to the other portion.

These were not the words of a proletarian at the barricades but of an established lawyer in a staid community, and they illustrate the degree of affection for natural law as well as aversion for the legislative process and its product. The abolition or disregard of all this intricate mass of legislation, and insistence by the judiciary upon the simple principles which he had outlined would suffice to bring the government into proper focus with relation to the people. It would no longer be an engine of "plunder, usurpation, and tyranny." Otherwise "the ignorant, the weak, and the poor," he said, would be the continual victims of government.[34]

Spooner's research in finance resulted in his proposal in 1861 for a decentralized banking structure strikingly similar to that of Greene's a dozen years before, and of Samuel Adams' and the Massachusetts Land Bank associates of 1740, although he indicated no knowledge of either at this time. It was based on the same principle: that currency should represent an invested rather than a specie dollar, and that mortgages on "property of a fixed and permanent nature" were to comprise the backing. Thus the currency would represent a certain amount of property, fulfilling Spooner's belief that sound money need not be backed by specie but by any type of durable, tangible wealth.[35]

Intended for operation in local areas, the Spooner bank plan incorporated a number of safeguards which were to provide assurance to the public that the mortgages behind the mutual money would always be ample. In the first place, the record of the mortgages were to be open to public inspection, so that each individual might judge for himself as to the sufficiency of the backing. The articles of the banking association were to be circulated in a widespread manner, in which were to be reproduced copies of the mortgages and the certificates of the appraisers, whom Spooner asserted would be "entitled to confidence" if they were selected from the community for their character and judgment. The amount of currency issued was to be restricted to from one-third to one-half of the total value of the real property involved in mortgages. Finally, in the articles of association it was to be made plain that all mortgages were to be made mutually responsible for each other; an insufficient mortgage had to be made good by the banking company. The effect of this provision was expected to make the bank founders examine each others' mortgages carefully and thus guarantee the integrity of all, since no one would wish to put in a good mortgage in the knowledge that one or more worthless ones were also entered.[36] Freedom from fraudulent appraisal was essential, therefore, making it necessary that free access to the records be provided to all for scrutiny at their pleasure. A sound mutual banking system would be provided when those who were to use the currency had the opportunity to know fully by what it was backed and by whom the mortgages which it represented had been appraised. Thus a democratic type of certification, said Spooner, would replace certification by one man or by agents of the state.

---

[32] *Poverty,* 59.

[33] *Poverty,* 59-60.

[34] *Poverty,* 61-62.

[35] The plan of this bank had actually been written in 1860, but was published along with *A New System of Paper Currency* a year later as *Articles of Association of a Mortgage Stock Banking Company.* For the details of the operation of the bank see Spooner, *New Paper Currency,* 9-13.

Spooner advanced much the same arguments for his bank as had Greene. It would furnish a stable, abundant currency with a low interest rate guaranteed by competition and limited only by the amount of real property, which was exceedingly more plentiful than specie. It would break up the monopoly of money by opening its possession to all who had something to mortgage. It would distribute credit equally through the community and by its abundance would bring about cash payments universally. It would diversify industry by affording credit for engaging in the production of new commodities as fast as they were invented.[37]

Adhering to his long-held premise that the state governments had no constitutional power whatever to prohibit any kind of banking which was "naturally just and lawful," he maintained that the system could be introduced lawfully and at the same time bypass chartering or special legislation. The arrangement of the association in the form of a stock company put it in the category with all other kinds of businesses.[38] The very fact that the conventional banking system required so much special legislation in its favor and the large volume of surveillance necessary thereafter was "sufficient evidence," charged Spooner, that it was naturally vicious and deserved abolition.[39]

---

[36] *New System of Paper Currency,* 14-15, 21-23. It was his belief that a local bank founded on fraudulent mortgages would be discredited at home, and get no circulation in other places at all. Having no credit at home, it certainly would get none "abroad," hence there would be no danger of swindling of the public by bad banks.

[37] *New System of Paper Currency,* 5, 15, 17-20.

[38] ". . . it seems plain enough that government has constitutionally no more power to forbid men's selling an invested dollar than it has to forbid the selling of a specie dollar. It has constitutionally no more power to forbid the

Spooner's *New System of Paper Currency* attracted the attention of Amasa Walker, one of the nation's outstanding financial conservatives. Walker questioned Spooner's standing as an exponent of finance, but admitted his plan was an honest one with no element of fraud or deception in its make-up. He noted also its similarity to that of Greene's but concluded with finality that neither would ever succeed.[40] Spooner, who designated Walker as "the highest authority in the country in opposition to all paper currency that does not represent gold and silver actually on hand," considered his objections beside the point, and was incensed and bitter at the condemnation received from such high conservative quarters.[41] He expected the economist to oppose any type of paper which represented property other than coin even though of equal market value, but what was particularly irking was to find himself compared with John Law. This notorious eighteenth century speculator had made no attempt to make his notes redeemable, it was pointed out, while the currency issued under his plan was backed by double its face value in mortgages on property which were appraised in terms of their values in gold dollars.[42]

Spooner introduced his bank project twice more, in 1864 and 1873, at which times federal activity in finance drew his excoriation. His mastery of vituperation became evident as he marshalled objections to the growth of practices and policies which benefited a narrowing minority. Two of the prominent measures by which the administration financed

---

sale of a single dollar, invested in a farm, than it has to forbid the sale of the whole farm.

The currency here proposed is not in the nature of a credit currency, . . . it constitutes simply of bona fide certificates of Stock, which the owners have the same right to sell that they have to sell any other Stocks." *New System of Paper Currency*, 17.

[39] *New System of Paper Currency*, 47-51.

[40] Amasa Walker, "Modern Alchemy," in *The Banker's Magazine and Statistical Register*, XI, new series, 407-413.

[41] See Spooner's remarks of twelve years later in *A New Banking System: The Needful Capital for Rebuilding the Burnt District*, 75-77, 413.

[42] "The property that is represented by the paper, and which constitutes the real money, is just as real substantial property as is gold or silver, or any other money or property whatever. And it is really an incorrect and false use of the term to call such money *paper money*, as if the paper itself were the real money; or as if there were no money, and no value, outside of the paper. A dollar's worth of land, wheat, iron, wool, or leather is just as much a dollar *in real value* as is a dollar of gold or silver; and when represented by paper, it is just as real money, as far as value is concerned, as is gold and silver." Spooner, "Gold and Silver as Standards of Value," in *Radical Review*, I, 765. This article was later translated and reprinted in the French language Costa Rican anarchist periodical *Le Sémeur*, I (October, 1927), 1-6. Stress is Spooner's.

the Civil War, the Legal Tender Acts and the National Banking Act, came under especially bitter fire. He condemned the legal tender acts as clearly unconstitutional on two counts; (1) for interfering with the right of contract, (2) for exceeding the grant of power to Congress.

Congress was delegated nowhere in the Constitution to provide a national currency, or to establish a legal tender which everyone was under obligation to accept and use in the contraction and payment of debts. The power to coin money and to regulate its value did not include the power to make its use universal and mandatory. The parties to a contract alone had the power to fix the tender. What the debtor agreed to pay and the creditor to receive was the legal tender, and Congress had no authority to alter this arrangement. Parties had no legal obligation to make their contracts payable in coin. "They are at perfect liberty to make them payable in wheat, corn, hay, iron, wool, cotton, pork, beef, or anything else they choose." The real purpose in coining money and establishing it as legal tender was not to force it upon parties to contracts, but to provide commodities whose qualities and quantities might be precisely ascertained, and which would be available for use by all who cared to do so. Congress did not make its money legal tender; the persons who used it as such made it so. To assert that Congress could fix the tender in payment of a debt, in a manner which made it independent of the agreement of the parties concerned, was to establish the power of Congress to make part of the contract, and that they clearly did not possess. Thus, he concluded, the general government was exceeding its commission and infringing on the right of contract by forcing into circulation its own currency and that of the banks it chose to authorize, to the exclusion of all others.[43]

The National Banking Act of February 25, 1863 was also a governmental creature in the interests of a privileged group. Congress had no more power to guarantee the notes of bankers than it had those of farmers, workers or merchants, nor to print their bank notes any more than to furnish their physical properties or pay the bank officers' salaries.[44] Congressional protection of private banks from liability for debts because they were at the same time engaged in performing services to the government also came under fire. The section of the act imposing a ten per cent tax upon all bills in circulation not authorized by Congress was declared even more reprehensible, especially in its potentialities, for by an extension of this principle, he saw nothing in the way of bringing the entire industry and commerce of the land under arbitrary control of congressional favorites.[45]

The appearance of *A New Banking System* in 1873 was not a response to the financial panic of that year but to the serious fire which devastated part of Spooner's adopted home city of Boston. He proposed that a plan be adopted to help rebuild by making use of the large reservoir of loanable capital in the form of real property in the state, and brought out once more his now familiar arguments in favor of the decentralized mutual banking scheme. Interwoven among the outlines were new blasts at government control of finance, pointing up evils which he painted in lurid shades and, with tendencies toward overstatement, laid directly at the door of the banking act of a decade before.[46]

---

[43] Spooner, *Considerations for Bankers and Holders of United States Bonds,* 37-49, 67-68.

[44] *Considerations,* 73-78.

[45] *Considerations,* 81-84.

It pained Spooner to hear constantly of the "National banking system" in tones which suggested a huge impersonal mechanism divorced from humanity and clothed with awesome characteristics. He went to the opposite extreme in denouncing the entire structure as palpably private in all respects and worthy of little reverence. The legal person known as a bank Spooner defined as a group of about 50 people, the actual lenders of money. It was his estimate that in a nation of nearly 40 millions, some 100,000 controlled all credit, and thus exercised similar power over the nation's property and labor:[47]

> The "National" system so called, is in reality no national system at all; except in the mere fact that it is called the national system and was established by the national government. It is, in truth, only a private system; a mere privilege conferred upon a few, to enable them to control prices, property, and labor, and thus swindle, plunder and oppress all the rest of the people.

Spooner recited the catalog of objectionable consequences, which included not only the limited supply of loanable capital but the accompanying high rates of interest. American manufacturers borrowed from the banks and then passed the high interest rates on to the ultimate consumers of their products. They could do so safely because the scarcity of money capital would preclude competitive action while the tariff walls would effectively restrain foreign competition to a minimum. The return to specie payments, in view of this situation, he charged, was a false issue, for the real purpose behind the hard money argument was to make credit even harder to obtain and thus insure the continued oligarchical control of the national financial structure.[48]

Spooner's *Our Financiers, Their Ignorance, Usurpations and Frauds,* which first appeared in Tucker's *Radical Review* in 1877,[49] summarized most of his previous stands in which he attacked the federal government as the real power upholding a privileged banking system. Protesting the prohibition by the government through taxation of any other than its own money, and the mass of regulatory and licensing legislation attending the entry into the banking business, he now mustered his choicest polemics for an attack upon the nation's financiers and their part in encouraging monopoly in business and industry. This was now inevitable in view of the increasing centralization of finance. "The establishment of a monopoly of money is equivalent to the establishment of monopolies in all the businesses that are carried on by means of money,"[50] he insisted, "equivalent to a prohibition upon all businesses except such as the monopolists of money may choose to license" through possessing the power of denying credit. For over twenty years after Spooner's death, the pages of Tucker's *Liberty* were to propagate this declaration, the "money monopoly" becoming the *bête noire* in Tucker's critical evaluation of maturing American capitalism.[51]

---

[46] Spooner, *New Banking System,* 5-6, 16-17, 25-33, 55-56.
[47] *New Banking System,* 19-20.
[48] *New Banking System,* 68-74.
[49] This was reprinted as a separate pamphlet this same year; page citations are from this latter edition.

II

The evolution of Lysander Spooner's philosophy to that of unalloyed anti-statism cannot be adequately observed through an examination of his economic thought alone. A long series of political writings paralleled his others. Through these runs the thread of persistent concern over the concepts of natural law, natural justice, and natural rights which eventually led him to denounce all man-made government as superflous and the legislative process as pure chicanery.

In two small books titled *The Unconstitutionality of Slavery,* the first of which appeared in 1845,[52] he advanced interpretations of law, justice, and government which became basic premises for his attack upon statute law and the nature and functions of the institutions of majority rule. He was not yet a confirmed anti-statist and his preoccupation in these essays was not with the authority of the Constitution but with its interpretation. He criticized Wendell Phillips and William Lloyd Garrison as guilty of grave inconsistency for holding the Constitution to be a slavery-supporting document. It was as an independent slavery-hating lawyer and not as an active participant in political abolitionism that Spooner wrote these works, however. Despite extended relations with Gerrit Smith[53] and the fact that some of his writings became Liberty Party campaign materials in the late 1840's,[54] there is no evidence of his membership in the party at any time, nor of political affiliation with Smith. His books are important for an entirely different reason than as contributions to the literature of the anti-slavery movement.

---

[50] Spooner, *Our Financiers,* 12.

[51] For late critical writings and support of the localized free banking system by Spooner, see *Our Financiers,* 3-13, 16-18; *The Law of Prices: A Demonstration of the Necessity for an Indefinite Increase of Money,* 3, 11-13; *Universal Wealth Shown to be Easily Attainable,* 3-9, 18-20.

[52] *The Unconstitutionality of Slavery; Part Second* followed in 1846, and the two were combined in 1847, in a single work. Subsequent editions appeared in 1853, 1856 and 1860. Spooner's other writing on the slavery question, again hinging on the legal aspect, was confined to a slim volume titled *A Defence for Fugitive Slaves Against the Acts of Congress of February 12, 1793 and September 18, 1850,* published in Boston in this latter year. Page citations from the first of the works on the unconstitutionality of slavery are from the 1845 edition, while from the second, the edition of 1856 has been used, the 1846 edition being especially scarce.

[53] Smith had high praise for Spooner's thesis, and remarked at one time that

Spooner was unsatisfied with the use of the word "law" except when defined as "an intelligible principle of right"[55] which existed in the nature of man and things. It of necessity had to be a permanent, universal and inflexible rule, incapable of being established "by mere will, numbers, or power." If this was the case, then, natural law was paramount to whatever rules of conduct might be established by man acting alone or in groups: "There is, and can be, correctly speaking, no law but natural law." In later writings he was to define natural law as "the science of men's rights,"[57] which were in their possession as such strictly on their standing as individuals. There were no such things as group rights, declared Spooner; "Society is only a number of individuals."[58]

Looking about him, he had to admit, nevertheless, that the definition which had come to be universally adopted was not that of the principle of "natural justice" but that of statute or decree. This latter he conceded to be nothing but the prescriptions of "self-styled governments, who have no other title to the prerogative of establishing such rules than is given them by the possession or command of sufficient physical power to coerce submission to them." This he condemned as an undisguised corruption of the term "law," which achieved dignity among the general populace because of the latter's "blind veneration for physical power." Such tacit approval of crime masquerading as law suggested to him an earlier age of human life when another type of superstition had "allowed falsehood, absurdity and cruelty to usurp the name and throne of religion."[59]

---

he believed it to be "unanswerable." Frothingham, *Gerrit Smith,* 202. For later legal relations between Spooner and Smith, see Harlow, *Gerrit Smith,* 417-422.

[54] See for instance its unanimous approval at the 1849 convention of the Liberty Party. Frothingham, *Gerrit Smith,* 190. For the failure of the formal inclusion of his main point in the Liberty Party creed, due to lack of support in the Midwest, consult Theodore C. Smith. *The Liberty and Free Soil Parties in the Northwest* (New York, 1897), 89, 98-101, 118-119.

[55] Spooner, *Unconstitutionality* (1845), 5.

[56] *Unconstitutionality* (1845), 8.

[57] In his *Poverty: Its Illegal Causes and Legal Cure* of 1846, Spooner had pronounced, "Natural law is the science of men's rights. . . . It is impossible that men can have any rights (either in person or in property), in violation of natural law,—for natural law is justice itself. . . . The nature of justice can no more be altered by legislation than the nature of numbers can be altered by the same means." *Poverty,* 63.

[58] Spooner, *The Law of Intellectual Property, or, An Essay On the Right of Authors and Inventors to Perpetual Property in Their Discoveries and Inventions,* 103; same author, *Poverty,* 64.

[59] *Unconstitutionality* (1845), 11-12.

Taking up Noah Webster's definition of municipal law,[60] which appeared to be that generally understood as sufficient to cover all usages in ordinary life, Spooner engaged in a structural analysis of it clause by clause, with the intent of demonstrating that it was in reality a shield for reprehensible behavior. He took particular exception to the phrase "supreme power of the state" as the evident source of the status of law. This expression apparently meant force in its largest concentration, which might be in the person or persons of one or several men. This rendered the principle of law extremely uncertain, and, in cases of wide dispersal of power through various factions, actually served to nullify it.[61] If law stemmed from the physical force requisite to obtain obedience thereto, then there was no real distinction between law and force, a condition which deprived it of all "moral character" and rendered it exceptionally unpalatable to a considerable audience. Another implication of this definition, said Spooner, was that a command to commit an injustice was as legal as a commission to perform justice, as long as it emanated from a source sufficiently strong to effect coercion.

If the concept of "law" was unsatisfactorily vague and impermanent, that of the "state" was even more so. Politically or sociologically, there appeared nothing fixed in its nature, character, or boundaries. Again it was the "will and power of individuals" which determined its establishment, and perpetually subject to abolition or incorporation within that of another, if overcome by individuals of greater strength. "A 'state,'" he pronounced, "is simply the boundaries within which any single combination, or concentration of will and power are efficient, or irresistible, for the time being."[62] Natural law, which recognized the validity of contracts "which men have a natural right to make,"[63] permitted the foundation of government on this basis, but only if the contract was that of an association of individuals, entered into consciously and voluntarily by each as an individual. This governmental contract might authorize means such as statutes "not inconsistent with natural justice for the better protection of men's natural rights,"[64] but under no conditions might it sanction the destruction of natural rights while ostensibly acting in a manner which might be interpreted as furthering them:[65]

---

[60] Of the twenty-five definitions for the word "law," Spooner extracted the second, "municipal law"; "a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power of a state, commanding what its subjects are to do, and prohibiting what they are to forbear; a statute." *An American Dictionary of the English Language; Exhibiting the Origin, Orthography, Pronunciation, and Definitions of Words* (New York, 1839), 488.

[61] *Unconstitutionality* (1845), 12-14.

[62] *Unconstitutionality* (1845), 15.

[63] *Unconstitutionality* (1845), 8.

[64] "This is the legitimate and true object of government: . . . rules and statutes not inconsistent with natural justice and men's natural rights, if enacted by such government, are binding, on the ground of contract, upon those who are parties to the contract which creates the government, and authorizes it to pass rules and statutes to carry out its objects." *Unconstitutionality* (1845), 9.

> . . . if the majority, however large, of the people enter into a contract of government called a constitution by which they agree to aid, abet or accomplish any kind of injustice, or to destroy or invade the natural rights of any person or persons whatsoever, this contract of government is unlawful and void. It confers no rightful authority upon those appointed to administer it. The only duties which anyone can owe to it, or to the government established under cover of its authority, are disobedience, resistance, destruction.

The idea that there was any inherent authority or sovereignty in a government as such Spooner scouted as an imposture, as he also did the belief in the right of a majority to restrain individuals from "exercise" of natural rights through the utility of "arbitrary enactments." These doctrines he placed in the same category as that of divine right of kings. Judicial tribunals were bound to declare the government or the majority acting in an illegal capacity, whenever involved in promoting anything which subverted natural law and its underlying principle, natural justice, which he defined in one place as "the rendering of equivalents."

Wendell Phillips'[66] reaction to Spooner's political philosophy, apart from his position on the constitutional status of slavery, produced a number of expected categorical rejections, but none more strong than that dealing with the duty of the judiciary. The purpose of a civil government of necessity required that the majority decide what was law, he said. Under Spooner's conception, not only was it an impossibility to conceive of "regular" government, but its adoption was "the first step toward anarchy."[67] In view of the fact that this latter term was not yet used in its scientific concept, the remark had a prophetic quality, in considering the extremity to which Spooner's logic carried him twenty years later.[68] It was Phillips' idea that people were bound to obey all legislative statutes, however unjust, until the body responsible for their passage arrived at their repeal. He did admit that revolution was a proper step in opposition to the "bad laws of a State," but that the laws remained on the statute books, and that judges were bound to enforce them until necessity was removed by the occurrence of a revolt.[69] In some ways the discussion tended to concern two different things, which at times was more or less admitted. Phillips said, "Mr. Spooner is at liberty to say that much of what the world *calls* law is not obligatory because it is not just. . . . But to assert that because a thing is not right it is not *law,* as that term is commonly and rightfully used, is entering into the question of what constitutes the basis of government among men."[70]

---

[65] *Unconstitutionality* (1845), 9-10.

[66] On the background of the publication of Phillips' *Review of Lysander Spooner's Essay on the Unconstitutionality of Slavery,* see Carlos Martyn (ed.), *Wendell Phillips the Agitator* (Boston, 1890), 216-217.

[67] *Review,* 15.

[68] "Mr. Spooner's idea is practical no-governmentism. It leaves everyone to do 'what is right in his own eyes.' After all, Messrs. Goodell and Spooner . . . are the real no-government men; . . ." *Review,* 10.

[69] *Review,* 25.

But Spooner pointed out that as a consequence of this belief, it would be impossible to distinguish between constitutional and unconstitutional laws, in the conventional sense, since those that *were* constitutional were binding only until repealed. This would therefore give illegal statutes the same status as the legal, and end by cancelling out the constitution and substituting the unlimited power of the government. Furthermore, while waiting for the repeal of a hateful enactment, the government might take such steps in the curtailment of civil rights and interruption of suffrage as to put it beyond popular power to have any effect in righting the evil condition.[71]

Where his previous theorizing had been confined primarily with an evaluation of the state as a political organism stemming from origins laid in force, with its effectiveness depending on the application of still more force when functioning through a government, Spooner now took up the matter of the composition of government. Aiming to neutralize Phillips' constant dwelling upon law and government as reflections of the majority will, he undertook to precipitate the majestic conception along lines of his own. Looking at the United States Constitution, he declared that the convention delegates represented only one-twentieth of the whole population in the country, and that statutory legislation was produced by men who represented only half of that number.[72] In view of the fact that voters chose a particular representative on the basis of his views on a limited number of "topics," this person was required to legislate on hundreds of others, therefore on such occasions he represented no one but himself. He charged constitutional and statutory law were "manufactured in a ridiculous and fraudulent manner," and especially so when they invaded or destroyed "the natural rights of large bodies of the people."[73] The judges who presided over their enforcement he considered hardly above the level of "felons."[74] This attack upon representative government he incorporated almost intact in avowedly anarchist

---

70. *Review,* 9.
71. See the extended development of this point in Spooner, *Defence for Fugitive Slaves,* 28.
72. *Unconstitutionality* (1856), 153-154.
73. "The whole object of legislation, excepting that legislation which merely makes regulations, and provides instrumentalities for carrying other laws into effect, is to overturn natural law, and substitute for it the arbitrary will of power. In other words, the whole object of it is to destroy men's rights. At least, such is its only effect, . . . Yet the advocates of arbitrary legislation are continally practising the fraud of pretending that unless the legislature *make* the laws, the laws will not be known. The whole object of the fraud is to secure to the government the authority of making laws that never ought to be known." *Unconstitutionality* (1856), 142.
74. *Unconstitutionality* (1856), 137, 152.

writings after the Civil War. Its inclusion in an anti-slavery pamphlet obviously intended to defend the Constitution from charges of being a slavery-protecting document[75] indicates the direction of his thought. The Spooner of 1887 was hardly more an anarchist than the Spooner of 1847.

By 1852, his attack upon government entered a new phase with the publication of *An Essay On The Trial By Jury.* This was a heavily-documented book which undertook to supply a radical revisionist study of this institution and its place in the state of his time. It was still being reprinted in an abridged form by the radical press as late as 1912.[76] The work had for its core the thesis that any legislation either in England or the United States which was in conflict with the common law was summarily invalid.[77] Its subject matter was the evolution of trial by jury from the times of Magna Charta to the mid-nineteenth century and its transformation into a piece of machinery of the state.

In establishing his objections, he made known that it was his understanding that juries in criminal cases over this long period of time were established to function in four specific capacities. There had been "no clearer principle of English or American constitutional law" than the recognized role of the jury in judging the facts of the case, what the law was, and the "moral intent of the accused." But, a fourth though rarely mentioned mission remained, their "primary and paramount duty":[78]

---

[75] There was of course a fundamental disagreement between Spooner and Phillips as to the sanction of slavery. Phillips maintained that it was recognized and allowed under English common law, which Spooner denied. He rejected Phillips' proof through utilizing the assumption that the villein of Magna Charta times was the equivalent of the 19th century slave. It was Spooner's opinion that the common law was improperly designated when assumed to be that prevailing in early 13th century England. Actually, he said, it predated the beginning even of the royal state, and that no subservience of one man to another predated the establishment of such superior and inferior relationshps by the state, in one capacity or another. Hence, he concluded, to observe that government abolished slavery at any particular time was merely to witness the undoing of a vicious condition which it had established under different circumstances in the first place. Spooner, *Law of Intellectual Property,* 170-173, 226-227; Phillips, *Review,* 94-95. For contradictory interpretations of slavery and origins of English common law, see William S. Holdsworth, *A History of English Law* (12 vols. London, 1922), II, 1, 30-31. It is beyond the scope of a work of this kind to enter into extended discussion of the complicated matter of the natural law doctrine and its implications. Of great value, especially with relation to the United States, are Charles G. Haines, *The Revival of Natural Law Concepts* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930); Benjamin F. Wright, *American Interpretations of Natural Law* (Cambridge, Mass., 1931). See also Hans Kelsen, *General Theory of Law and State* (Anders Wedberg, translator) (Cambridge, Mass., 1945).

[76] An abbreviated edition of this work, edited by Victor Yarros, appeared in Boston in 1890 under the title *Free Political Institutions,* after having been printed serially in *Liberty* from June 8 through December 28, 1889. A second edition in book form was published in London in 1912, under this same title. See the brief interpretation by A. John Alexander, "The Ideas of Lysander Spooner," in *New England Quarterly,* XXIII (June, 1950), 200-217, which stresses this work.

[77] Spooner, *Trial by Jury,* introduction, i.

> . . . to judge of the justice of the law, and to hold all laws invalid that are in their opinion, unjust or oppressive, and all persons guiltless, in violating or resisting the execution of such laws.

Trial by jury, declared Spooner, indicated a fundamental attitude among Anglo-Saxon people toward their institutions, a distrust of the government. This was reflected in the numerous impediments placed in the way of unrestrained exercise of power by a few, which the governmental conception made feasible and inviting. Unsatisfied by the machinery of obstruction placed within the governmental structure itself, another restraint on the exercise of power was reserved for erection outside it, this being the trial by jury. This, he said, was a trial "by the country," in contra-distinction to a governmental tribunal. Its ideal objective was to define and locate popular liberties against the government, rather than allowing the government to set its own limits of operation. It was an impossibility for the people to have any liberties apart from those graciously granted them by the government, unless they were allowed to determine the nature of them through a process free from any degree of governmental interference.

On one particular matter Spooner was emphatic, and that was on defining the term "jury" and interpreting its origin. It was a technical term, he insisted, derived from the common law; hence when the American constitutions, federal or state, provided for the jury trial, it was in the spirit of the common law that this tribunal was to be constructed, and not merely a facsimile which the government chose to devise in its image. In other words, it was the "thing" and not the "name" which was to be provided, thus making it obligatory that jury selection be made according to common law principles.[80]

Of these, two were absolutely essential: (1) in the particular geographical area in question, all the adults were eligible for selection thereon; (2) when the time of actual selection for any particular case was at hand, it should take place in such manner as to bar all possibility of its choice by the government, or governmental interference in the selection.[81] Any legislation which infringed on these two principles was

---

[78] *Trial by Jury,* 5. Spooner believed that if the jury had no right to judge "of the justice of the law," it would be no protection to the accused person, since the government might easily go on from there to dictate the "laws of evidence" and the weight that might be given to such evidence as they cared to admit in any given trial.

Many ideas expressed in this work had already been given by Spooner in others written in 1850. See for example *Defence for Fugitive Slaves,* 5-6, 18-25, 67-70; *Illegality of the Trial of John W. Webster,* 3-15.

[79] *Trial by Jury,* 6.

[80] *Trial by Jury,* 142.

[81] *Trial by Jury,* 143.

"unconstitutional," therefore, and the judgments of juries which owed their existence to such special circumstance were absolutely "void," since trial by jury had been "abolished" by the first intrusion of the government into such affairs. Spooner charged that in the England and United States of his time, there existed sufficient evidence that the "true" trial by jury did not exist at all, nor had it done so for many years. In England the establishment of property qualifications restricted the selection to less than the whole, an illegality exceeded only by the removal from the people of the right of selecting the sheriffs. Formerly popular officials in charge of the selection of juries, now, said Spooner, they were little more than the king's "tools," and allowed for virtual selection by the king of such juries as he might wish.[82] In the United States, things were hardly any better. He declared that there was no state in which all the names of "adult males" living within its bounds were placed in a box for jury selection. The fact that jurors were selected by sheriffs who owed their appointments to state governors, or by county court judges and clerks of circuit or county courts, was conclusive proof of the "illegality" of the operation of the system in this country.[83] On the basis of common law criteria, he believed that there never had been a single legal jury trial in the history of the country since the adoption of the Constitution. Hence juries were of no use in controlling the government or preserving popular liberties. Nor was this all; protested Spooner:[84]

> If the real trial by jury had been preserved in the courts of the United States—that is, if we had had legal juries, and the jurors had known their rights,—it is hardly probable that one-tenth of the past legislation of Congress would ever have been enacted, or at least, that, if enacted, it could never have been enforced.

Later anarchist hatred of legislation carried no more implications than did this.[85] His proposal included two specific recommendations for rectifying this trend away from popular control. First he proposed appointment of jurors from the names of all adult males contained in a common jury-box for the area regardless of the size of the unit, without those chosen learning that fact from the officials designated to select. Secondly, and also in line with common law conceptions as he saw them, all judges presiding over juries in criminal trials should of necessity be chosen by the people, and not appointed by the government acting in either its executive or legislative capacity.[86]

---

[82] *Trial by Jury,* 155.

[83] *Trial by Jury,* 156.

[84] *Trial by Jury,* page cited above.

[85] By this time Spooner was convinced that the study of statutory and constitutional law was not one of a definite science of abstract and permanent principles, but one of a technique of language. Like Warren, he objected to the uncertainty and nebulousness of wording which made statutes capable of a wide variety of interpretations. This only strengthened his suspicions that the "government of law" which he heard constantly mentioned in platitudinous speeches in actuality depended upon the judgment, in many situations, of a single man as to what the law really was.

Spooner had other things in mind besides the guaranteeing of fairness to any particular individual seeking justice through the jury trial system. He was convinced that a jury, obtained in such a way as to preclude the possibility of the government learning its composition, made it exceedingly difficult for the government to pack it with its partisans.[87] Therefore, the jury "veto" was a much sounder guarantee against the perpetuation of "unjust and oppressive" laws than reliance upon repeal by a succeeding legislature brought into power by the exercise of the franchise:[88]

> As unanimity is required for a conviction, it follows that no one can be convicted, except for the violation of such laws as substantially the whole country wish to have maintained. The government can enforce none of its laws (by punishing offenders, through the verdicts of its juries), except such as substantially the whole people wish to have enforced.

Spooner, obsessed with the importance of the struggle for the preservation of minority rights, felt that at best the "government" was a portion or "faction" of the people, interested in the support of its program. The legislators involved were "irresponsible" during the period for which they were elected, generally free from fear of removal and neither accountable nor "punishable" when their term in office had elapsed. Hope of a greater degree of honesty on the part of a succeeding legislature was not sound; if the group they were elected to replace could be proved to have been elected for "motives of injustice," it merely demonstrated that a portion of society had desired to establish injustice, and might succeed in more effective manner at a subsequent date. Change was no guarantee of betterment; it might even result in a worsening of conditions. A government that could enforce its laws for one day without making recourse to the "whole" people directly or through one of its representative tribunals was an absolute government. Trial by jury served the function of demanding that the government obtain its consent before punishing the violators of the laws it passed. It was the further supposition that twelve men chosen by lot from the mass of the people constituted a more representative cross-section of "the country" than any group representing "the government." Trial by jury gave to anyone the freedom of choice to violate any of the government's

---

86. *Trial by Jury,* 156, 164.
87. Spooner castigated the practice of the government, on empanelling juries, of inquring of prospective jurors whether they had scruples against finding verdicts of guilty in cases of a specific crime. Mentioning as examples the fugitive slave laws and capital punishment, he was convinced that in such cases the government was clearly overstepping its bounds. *Trial by Jury,* 8-9.
88. *Trial by Jury,* 7.

laws, should such individual be willing to allow the jury to decide whether the law broken was a just one. Should even a "reasonable doubt" exist as to the justice of the law, the benefit of such doubt should be given to the defendant and not to the government.[89]

In one sense, said Spooner, trial by jury was a formal establishment of the right of revolution, which no government ever willingly acknowledged. Government never admitted the injustice of its laws, and revolt was possible only by such elements as actually established a degree of physical strength superior to the government. If they should prove unsuccessful, regardless of the justifiability of the rebellion, they were always subject to punishment for treason, since the government in power alone judged the nature of treason.[90] Trial by jury in the sense in which he was speaking of it was the only real support for this "right of resistance." Constitutions were no effective limit to the power of the government, if those in power felt that the people would not compel them to remain within its restrictions. "If the people are as good as their word, they may keep the government within the bounds they have set for it; otherwise it will disregard them."[91] Granted the existence of a jury trial system which still remained in complete popular control, resistance to governmental overbearing was thus made available, and neutralization of "tyrannical" legislation made possible without recourse to violence.

Spooner dismissed the argument that the government was an instrument created by the people for the purpose of furthering their own interests, and that to allow the jury, a popularly chosen and representative body, to invalidate acts of the government, was to pit the people against themselves. He pointed out that regardless of the degree of faith in the impartiality of the government existing among the people as a whole, there already were a number of "tribunals" before which acts of the government were required to undergo review. To add the jury to both houses of the national legislature, the president, and the judges of the federal court system was no significant deviation.[92]

In his mind, the real issue was even more basic than this. It was imperative that the jury once more be installed in its previous position of theoretical dominance to preserve the small amount of political liberty wrung from past despotisms.[93] The divine right of kings, he said, was "fast giving place" to another fetish, the belief that in a given area, the larger number of the people had a right to govern the smaller. Granted that majority rule might be less onerous than rule by a single tyrant, still the principle was no more true. "Obviously there is nothing in the nature of majorities that insures justice at their hands," he declared; they had the same frailties as minorities, and had no qualities which made it evident that they were immune from acting in an oppressive manner. The "question of right" remained far above the matter of political tactics, and was no more determined in a situation where two men ruled one than where one man ruled two. To take for granted the coincidence of justice and majority will, he warned, "is only another form of the doctrine that might makes right."[94]

---

[89] *Trial by Jury,* 13-15, 178-180, 189-190.

[90] *Trial by Jury,* 16.

[91] *Trial by Jury,* 19.

[92] *Trial by Jury,* 12.

[93] One of Spooner's special distastes was the doctrine that "ignorance of the law excuses no one," a "preposterous" device which the courts asserted as a means of preserving "absolute power in the government." The right of the jury to judge the statutes of the government and to decide whether they infringed on the rights of the citizens was thus vitiated. *Trial by Jury,* 181.

Another implication stemmed from the assumption of the virtuousness of majority rule. Minorities had no rights in the government. This was a necessary concomitant, in view of the fact that the majority determined what rights the minority were to enjoy, without hindrance from the latter. This was an intolerable situation; the minority should have at least one weapon available unqualifiedly at its disposal:[95]

> It is indispensable to a *free* government . . . that the minority, the weaker party, have a veto upon the acts of the majority. Political liberty is liberty for the *weaker party* in a nation. It is only the weaker party that lose their liberties when a government becomes oppressive. The stronger party, in all governments, are free by virtue of their superior strength. They never oppress themselves. Legislation is the work of the stronger party; and if . . . they have the sole power of determining what legislation shall be enforced, they have all power in their hands, and the weaker party are the subjects of an absolute government.

Nor would Spooner countenance majority rule on the basis of the argument that the side of superior numerical strength was a more or less valid indication of probability of being "right." The "lives, liberties and properties of men" were of too great esteem to risk them to possible destruction unless the action in which men engaged was based on "certainty beyond a reasonable doubt,"[96] and this was insured only by the unanimity which the jury principle made obligatory. In one sense, this process enabled the minority to "defeat the will" of the majority, but only in a negative capacity. No possibility of passage of laws by the minority existed; the refusal to back laws which they found undesirable to themselves was all that the trial by jury might reinforce, at best.[97]

Such was the gist of Spooner's plea on behalf of the reinstatement of a system of trial by jury which confirmed anti-statists of a later generation, as well as Spooner himself during his last years, viewed as the only sure protection from governmental oppression short of violent revolutionary action. *Trial by Jury* also marked the end of his political writing which retained any noticeable element of restraint. In a series of pamphlets titled *No Treason*[98] which he began publishing a short while after the close of the Civil War, he compounded an attack on the conduct of the war, the Republican Party, and eventually the entire structure of political democracy. While the earliest of the series reflected in part the disillusionment of a portion of the intellectual fringe of the New England anti-slavery element, and dwelt at some length upon the material consequences of the war,[99] the last developed into an attack upon the institutional state and the United States Constitution which surpassed in extremity and daring any similar document written and published by a native American. Many of the arguments and much of the spirit of *No Treason* were revived fifteen years later, when a fully-developed anarchist press was in full bloom.

---

[94] *Trial by Jury,* 206-207.

[95] *Trial by Jury,* 214-215.

[96] *Trial by Jury,* 208. Spooner would probably have been delighted by Ibsen's assertion that the majority was always wrong.

[97] "It will be said that if the minority can defeat the will of the majority, then the minority rule the majority. But this is not true in any unjust sense. The minority enact no laws of their own. They simply refuse their assent to such laws of the majority as they do not approve. The minority assume no authority over the majority; they simply defend themselves. They propose a union; but decline submission." *Trial by Jury,* 218-219.

Spooner's anti-government sentiments were thoroughly aroused by boasting on the part of elements of the North over the crushing of Southern "dissent" in the name of "liberty and free government." He said it resembled a holy war fought in the interests of establishing a state religion, and in actuality took the form of a repudiation of government by consent.[100] The idea of a government by consent implied an important principle: consent from each individual person who was required to furnish support to the government either through the paying of taxes or supplying some type of personal service. Without this, it must be admitted that the government in question is not founded on consent at all. To obtain the consent of only so many as was necessary to obtain control over the remainder was not establishing a government by consent; rather, it was the fruition of "a mere conspiracy of the strong against the weak." Consent could not be presumed in any case whatsoever, despite the prevailing tendencies of governments to do so. Spooner held that the surest sign that a government was not "free" was the prevalence of coercion in securing support of any number of persons, no matter how small. "There is no other criterion," he charged, "by which to determine whether a government is a free one, or not, then the single one of its depending, or not depending, solely on voluntary support."[101]

---

[98] This series was to have consisted of six numbers, but only 1, 2 and 6 ever were published. In the foreword to the sixth series, Spooner revealed that the previous three were non-existent, but gave no reason for the hiatus.

[99] Despite his hatred of things political, Spooner and a few associates in the East formed a curious little group known as the Free Constitutionalists, with the aim of defeating the Republican Party in the 1860 election. Convinced that the Republican stand on the slavery issue was hypocritical, the Spooner group believed that a defeat would cause a rupture in the party and a reforming of lines with all those not entirely opposed to slavery no longer part of its structure. The issue of slavery in the territories was a blind to cover the real issue, whether a man was a slave in any of the states in the Union. Spooner contended that if he was a slave in one state, he was in the same status in all, and if free in one, he was a free man in all the remainder. See the interesting *Address of the Free Constitutionalists to the People of the United States* (Boston, 1860), 2-4, 7-19, 30, 38-46, 53-54. Spooner underestimated the capacity of the South for rebellion. Five years before the war began, he predicted that the South would not secede. Deploring force, he was unable to comprehend the possibility of its utility in settling the matter of slavery or sectional controversy, which he continued to consider in abstract and legal or constitutional dress. See his *Unconstitutionality of Slavery* (1856), 293-294.

[100] Spooner, *No Treason* (No. I, The Suppression of the Rebellion Finally Disposes of the Pretence That the United States Government Rests on Consent), 3-6, 10. Spooner later entered into a thoroughgoing economic interpretation of the war. He asserted that control of Southern markets was the real motive behind Northern business participation in the war, and not any love of abstract liberty or justice. The loan of enormous sums of money at high rates of interest to the North was now going to be repaid by the Republican administration through a large-scale tax program, with an extra

Having expressed his conception of the anarchist foundation of society, the voluntary organization through free association, he went on to hammer away at the orthodox understandings of government by consent and the sensitive problem of treason. He considered the South "equally erroneous" with the North concerning allegiance. The latter he claimed insisted that each individual was held in allegiance to the federal government, the former similarly claimed such adherence was due the state government. Spooner disavowed the owing of "involuntary" allegiance on the part of the individual to either of these political structures.[102] The very word "allegiance" itself appeared nowhere in the Constitution. Nor did any similar word, implying the existence of such "services" as fidelity or obedience to the government, occur in the document. His examination of the preamble to the Constitution convinced him that the latter "professes to rest wholly on consent," and that any material relation or spiritual attitude toward the government on the part of the individual persons stemmed wholly from this condition of consent. Duty or obligation were not a part of this matter, nor could either be so at a later time.[103]

In addition to this, several facts convinced him that at best the Constitution could not be construed in any sense but that of an "association during pleasure." Those who made it had no power to contract for others than themselves in political or any other matters. To maintain that a group of men might make political agreements binding on future generations was as valid as to believe that they also possessed the power

---

advantage thrown to the manufacturers in the form of high tariffs. He labeled Grant "the chief murderer of the war," and the "agent" of the "new policy" of high tariffs, high taxes and monopoly of the currency through the creation of the new banking system. *No Treason* (No. VI, The Constitution of No Authority), 54-58. See also Curti, *Peace or War,* 71, 134.

[101] *No Treason* (No. I), 6-8; *No Treason* (No. II, The Constitution), 13.

[102] *No Treason* (No. II), 13.

[103] *No Treason* (No. II), 11.

to make business or marriage contracts mandatory upon them. In the case of those who adopted the Constitution, no evidence existed to indicate the period of time for which they pledged their support. Hence the "original parties" to this article of government were, at most, bound for no longer than the period during which they cared to give it their support, and certainly for no longer a time than their own life span.[104] Spooner insisted that if the Constitution was to be considered the work of individual persons, there was "no escape" from such conclusions as these.

Viewed in this light, the issue of treason also underwent a qualification through definition. Governments not founded upon the principle of "consent" assumed the unwavering fidelity of all people living under them, and were inclined to view all resisters as treasonous. This was the addiction of the absolutist, said Spooner, and was a "false and calumnious" application.[105] Treason properly designated meant only treacherous or deceitful conduct resulting in a wilful breach of faith; an open enemy in the act of rebellion could not be construed a traitor under any stretching of the meaning of the word.[106] For this reason he dismissed the heated northern sentiment which leaned toward wholesale indictment of the South on this charge. Treason rested its entire case upon the supposition that the accused person had at one time granted his consent, and had subsequently acted in an unfaithful manner. Unless prior consent could be proved against the person involved in treachery accusations, the case could not stand, since it was impossible to be treasonous to a government if support to it had never been *voluntarily* yielded.[107]

Such tightly-wired theoretical arguments filled much of the *No Treason* pamphlets. Indulgence in personalities and specific citations was not prominent until the final number of the series appeared in 1870. In this he flatly rejected the entire Constitution and all the political usages that had grown under it throughout its existence, after a quarter century of writing about the problem created by its devious interpretation. It is true that in view of his doctrine of individual voluntary consent he had long been dubious of the process of adoption, due to the by-passing of the women, children, Negroes, and a large percentage of the nation's white adult males through state property qualifications. Now his opposition was summary in nature. He was convinced that the instruments of government were being utilized almost wholly in the interests of a few favored segments of the population. Written in a provoking and inflammatory style, midway during the Reconstruction period, its sentiment was transmitted almost intact to a later time when conscious anarchists absorbed it into their propaganda.

---

[104] *No Treason* (No. II), 3-5, 11, 16.

[105] *No Treason* (No. I), 12-14. The American Revolution, said Spooner, was the result of separate voluntary actions taken by individuals; the colonial governments had no right to absolve the people from allegiance to the king, and when acting as legislatures, it was in the capacity of individual revolutionists only. Therefore George III erred in calling the colonists traitors, since they had not declared their allegiance to him as individuals, and betrayed nobody.

[106] *No Treason* (No. II), 7-8.

[107] *No Treason* (No. II), 8, 11-12.

Spooner recited his argument that the Constitution possessed no authority of itself, and that it merely represented a contract drawn up among persons now long dead, even though relatively few persons then living had been allowed to take formal part in expressing either approval or dissent at the time of its adoption. He denied the possibility of legally establishing its binding character upon generations since that time; "There is in the Constitution nothing that professes or attempts to bind the 'posterity' of those who establish it." To assume as much amounted to making people the "slaves of their foolish, tyrannical and dead grandfathers."[108] Thus Spooner in a prominent sense was engaged in reviving the stand of the critics of Thomas Hobbes and the social contract theory, who held that the only persons bound to such an agreement were those actually participating in a pact of submission to a ruler. Therefore, being unable to act for anyone but themselves, they could certainly be unable to bind their posterity to an unchanging order.[109]

The principal onslaughts in this last pamphlet were directed at the voting, taxpaying, and lawmaking functions performed under the representative democracy. It was his contention that neither participation in elections nor the paying of taxes were valid evidence of either support or attachment to the Constitution, despite general assertions in the affirmative. The manner in which these functions were performed precluded such an interpretation. A voluntary vote indicated support of the basic document of government; however, denoted Spooner, the restricted number allowed access to the ballot made the process the obvious workings of a minority. Without citing actual statistics, he estimated that no more than one-sixth of the entire nation's population had access to the voting booths, and only a fraction of those qualified actually performed the act of voting. Therefore, all those failing to vote technically withheld their support of the Constitution, and thus the government was clearly a conscious product of a minority. This was not his only argument. He questioned the possibility of determining those who actually voted voluntarily, as well as specifically locating the "voluntary supporters" of any given government:[110]

---

[108] *No Treason* (No. VI), 3-6. Nearly a half century before, Thomas Jefferson declared, "Can one generation bind another in succession forever? I think not. . . . Rights and powers can only belong to persons, not to things. . . . A generation may bind itself as long as its majority continues in life; when it has disappeared, another majority is in place, hold all the rights and powers their predecessors once held, and may change their laws and institutions to suit themselves." Thomas Jefferson to Major John Cortwright, June 5, 1824, in Andrew A. Lipscomb (ed.), *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (19 vols. Washington, 1904), XVI, 48.

[109] Ernst Cassirer, *The Myth of the State* (New Haven, 1946), 173-175.

[110] *No Treason* (No. VI), 11. If people wished to conduct a government on the order which the Constitution provided for, then there was no reason

> As everybody who supports the Constitution by voting . . . does so secretly, and in a way to avoid all personal responsibility for the acts of his agents or representatives, it cannot legally or reasonably be said that anybody at all supports the Constitution by voting. No man can reasonably or legally be said to do such a thing as to assent to, or support, the Constitution, unless he does it openly, and in a way to make himself personally responsible for the acts of his agents, so long as they act within the limits of the power he delegates to them.

The secret ballot he looked upon as a source of two kinds of evil. It enabled groups of people who were not in accord to continue acting without an understanding, and to look forward with expectancy to belonging to the more numerous group in the hopes of thus forcing their desires and wills upon the other. In addition it permitted the rise of an office-holding group which operated in an irresponsible vacuum, blessed with anonymity through the secret ballot, which destroyed the possibility of planting specific responsibility. "The secret ballot makes a secret government," charged Spooner: "Open despotism is better than this. The single despot stands out in the face of all men and says: I am the State: my will is law; I am your master. I take the responsibility of my acts; . . . But a secret government is little better than a government of assassins."[111]

The combination of the secret ballot and Article I, Section 6 of the Constitution served to demolish any notions remaining that a government of open responsibility was intended. Elected to office by people whom they did not know, senators and representatives were protected by this part of the Constitution from responsibility for any legislation which they might subsequently pass while in this office. The right to vote out incumbents every two, four, or six years was no "remedy" for this situation; they were merely replaced by others who exercised similar "absolute and irresponsible" power.[112] A person injured by the passage of legislation was unable to place responsibility upon a single person either inside or outside the legislative halls, and least of all the latter: "these pretended agents of the people, of everybody, are really the agents of nobody."[113] The claim of legislators to being the representatives of the people, while at the same time being granted immunity by the Constitution for their actions as legislators, he decried a contradiction, since one could not be responsible and irresponsible for the same thing at the same time.

---

why they should not sign the "instrument" itself, so as to openly certify their wishes and also to make themselves individually responsible for such governmental acts as might transpire. It was Spooner's belief that the reason the people at large were not asked to sign the Constitution was the fear that if given the opportunity as individuals, they would have rejected it. *No Treason* (No. VI), 26-27.

[111] *No Treason* (No. VI), 28-29.

[112] *No Treason* (No. VI), 23.

[113] *No Treason* (No. VI), 25.

In like manner, the payment of taxes was no more a valid method of determining voluntary support[114] to the Constitution than participation in voting. The theory that taxes were paid voluntarily was involved in this interpretation, disregarding the "practical fact" that most tax remittances were made "under the compulsion of threat." Taxpayers acceded to the policies of the abstraction "the government" through fear of jail, confiscation, or violence should they make physical resistance.[115] Unable to determine the nature of the "government," the individual knew only the tax-collector, another person representing himself as an "agent" of this "government," and payment was made with no comprehension of the destination of eventual disposal of his money. He warned that a tax structure of this kind was a serious threat to "liberty," since all political power eventually depended upon money, and the entity controlling the money collected in taxes might pursue a course of action ruinous to the very supplier of the funds thus utilized. That taxes might be justified on the basis that collection was made by some men from other men, for the purpose of "protecting" them, he labeled as "perfect absurdity." He considered individuals competent enough to make their own arrangements of this kind, and certainly no warrant existed for the protection of anyone against his will.[116] Advised Spooner, "the only security men can have for their political liberty consists in keeping their money in their own pockets, until they have assurances perfectly satisfactory to themselves that it will be used for their benefit."[117]

The *No Treason* blast touched other items of controversial content. Oaths given by governmental officials, soldiers, naturalized persons and the late rebels of the South he dismissed as "of no validity or obligation" due to the inability of specifically designating to whom they were given. Pledges to support the Constitution in the name of "the people of the United States" or similar generalities were written off as ineffective and inadequate.[118] Nor did he believe that the governments of European countries entertained degrees of political virtue lacking in his own land. The monarchies of Europe he described as corrupt alliances between

---

[114] Said Spooner on this matter in 1852, "Trial by the country, and no taxation without consent were the two pillars of English liberty . . . and the first principles of the Common Law. It was a principle of the Common Law, as it is of the law of nature, and of common sense, that no man can be taxed without his personal consent. The Common Law knew nothing of that system . . . of *assuming* a man's own consent to be taxed because some pretended representative, whom he had never authorized to act for him, has taken it upon himself to consent that he may be taxed. This is one of the many frauds on the Common Law . . . which have been introduced since Magna Charta. Having finally established itself in England, it has been stupidly and servilely copied and submitted to in the United States." *Trial by Jury,* 222-223.

[115] *No Treason* (No. VI), 14-15.

[116] *No Treason* (No. VI), 15-17.

[117] *No Treason* (No. VI), 17.

[118] *No Treason* (No. VI), 35-36, 39-41.

"discredited royalties" and large continental banking houses. Since the latter supplied the funds which equipped and paid the various armies, the power of the national states of Europe logically lay in the control of finance capitalism. It was impossible for a ruling house to survive in any other way. Adequate credit relations had to be maintained with the banks to remain in power, while these latter received the benefits derived from the exploitation of the taxpayers, trade relations with weaker neighbors and satellites, and the regimentation of the submerged colonial peoples of the respective countries.[119] Our diplomatic relations with these lands were thus involving the United States government with even less worthy individuals acting in a supposed representative capacity on their own part.[120]

In spite of the extremity and provocativeness of his attacks upon both the theory and practice of government in the United States, it is unlikely that Lysander Spooner's writings excited more than local intellectual curiosity. For over ten years after the completion of the *No Treason* series his writings in defense of anarchism were buried in a number of treatises on free banking. Due to his preference for non-associative criticism, it is probable that Spooner might have remained in obscurity for the remainder of his time had not the great increase of anarchist writing and periodical publication of the period after 1880 brought some of his defenses of anti-statism to the attention of a wide international reading audience of radical bent.

The publication of his pamphlet *Natural Law*[121] in 1882 came to the attention of anarchist groups both in the United States and Europe. A short while later, as an independent contributor to *Liberty,* his standing in the anarchist camp grew rapidly. *Natural Law* was an essay in political and social philosophy primarily, but written to establish the thesis that human legislation was impotent and futile when made in ignorance, conscious or otherwise, of the "principle of justice" embodied in "natural law."

Spooner's primary objective was to establish the principles of natural law and what he termed the "science of justice," which, he said, stemmed from the phenomenon of "natural rights." Each person either came into the world with these rights, or else he passed his existence without them, for clearly they were not capable of being manufactured and distributed by men at some undesignated time later on.[122] What was known as justice merely defined what rights all obtained at birth, and to deny that such was the case put all discussions of justice and rights forever off the agenda of humanity. If there was no natural principle of justice, then the possibility of a moral standard[123] did not exist, and the concepts of "justice" and "injustice" themselves were absolutely meaningless. Furthermore, the concept of crime was mere imagination, and all that transpired on earth resembled natural occurrences such as rainstorms and the growth of vegetation.[124] "If justice be not a natural principle," he deduced, "governments have no reason to take cognizance of a non-entity, and all their professions of establishing justice or of maintaining justice are simply the gibberish of fools."[125]

---

[119] He was especially outspoken in his denunciation of the "National Debt," which he dismissed as a fiction, declaring that the war had been actually paid for as it had been fought, and that the whole debt might be defaulted by the mere act of individuals refusing to pay taxes. Not a penny of actual wealth would be destroyed by this process, concluding that the Republican slogan "maintaining the National Honor" was a "mere shibboleth," designed to mask a gigantic levy upon the taxpayers in order to pay the interest on the loans of the Northern bankers. *No Treason* (No. VI), 56, 58-59.

[120] *No Treason* (No. VI), 42-43, 47-51.

[121] The full title of this pamphlet was *Natural Law; or the Science of Justice; a Treatise on Natural Law, Natural Justice, Natural Rights, Natural Liberty, and Natural Society, Showing That All Legislation Whatsoever Is an Absurdity, a Usurpation and a Crime.* For a reprint see *Liberty,* I (March 18, 1882), 4.

[122] *Natural Law,* 12.

On the other hand, if it were admitted that there was such a thing as a natural principle of justice, then it must of necessity be no more susceptible to alteration or change than gravitation. Thus there was no place for the legislation of men in this situation either, for it was an "assumption of authority and dominion" where the right to do so did not exist, nor where the necessity for such was needed. Thus there was a "science" of justice, "that each should live honestly toward each other,"[126] which was capable of being learned as were the other sciences. In fact, he insisted that for the most part, the fundamentals of the science of justice were often learned and practiced before the words which were used to describe it were understood.[127]

How, then, were governments and legislation to be accounted for? To Spooner, both were subversions of natural justice and natural law, growing from an attempt of a portion of mankind to live off the production of the remainder, and extended as far back in history as the period when the systematic cultivation of the soil made possible an accumulation of material wealth in excess of that needed for daily needs on the part of the cultivators.[128] From the actual slavery of both the producer and his product there evolved an emancipation from the former condition. The retention of ownership of land and the means of production made it mandatory that the newly freed in body "sell" their labor, which practically restored the former situation. The relative mobility of the non-owning group and the tendency for the earning of a living to become lodged in a groove of unending insecurity promoted a large volume of social disruptions such as stealing. This prompted the passage of numerous laws defining such activities as crimes, "to keep these dangerous people in subjection." There was just one purpose for the formation of the historic state, "simply to keep one class of men in subordination and servitude to another."[129] As unpalatable as such an interpretation might prove to be among other shades of society, conservative, liberal, or radical, the fact that *Natural Law* went into three editions in three years[130] indicated the acceptability of its message among the anarchists.

---

[123] *Natural Law,* 11, 15.

[124] "All comparisons as honesty vs. dishonesty, justice vs. injustice, etc., postulate a natural principle, otherwise they are meaningless words and admit that the greatest force and fraud are the only laws for governing the relations of men with each other." *Natural Law,* 14.

[125] *Natural Law,* 10.

[126] *Natural Law,* 6. He foresaw the need of voluntary associations, however, "for the maintenance of justice" and "protection against wrong-doers," the former among themselves, the latter a defense against outside molesters. He retained the Warrenite principle of respecting the individual right of choice to remain outside the association, holding coercion unjustified under any circumstances.

[127] This he believed could be observed in the conduct of young children, especially in the reactions to theft and bodily aggression. *Natural Law,* 8-9.

[128] *Natural Law,* 17.

Spooner, now living in retirement in Boston, contributed two final additions to the anti-state literature which, although producing little new thought, were the most amazing and daring of all in that they were addressed to prominent public figures in American political life. Shortly after the appearance of *Natural Law,* his *Letter to Thomas F. Bayard* was featured in *Liberty.*[131] Using the veteran Delaware senator as a symbol of the representative government which he despised so thoroughly, the unregenerate Boston anarchist summed up his arguments against the delegation of legislative power,[132] the secret ballot, the passage of legislation, and the validity of the Constitution.[133]

---

[129] *Natural Law,* 18, 20-21. For the similarity of Spooner's interpretation to the sociological concept of the state as developed by later students, compare with that of Franz Oppenheimer, *The State,* 15-21, 274-289.

[130] *Natural Law* was read eagerly by European anarchists, and furnished the inspiration for the series of articles published in the Swiss anarchist periodical *Le Révolté* under the title "Law and Authority." These sought to establish in the minds of the readers of the anti-statist press the relative novelty of codified law in the whole of human history, and to disprove the beneficial character ascribed to civilizations noted for extended legal systems. For a friendly American commentary see *Liberty,* I (July 22, 1882), 1.

[131] As "A Letter to Thomas F. Bayard: Challenging His Right and the Right of All Other So-called Senators and Representatives in Congress—To Exercise Any Legislative Power Whatever Over the People of the United States," it was first published in *Liberty,* II (May 27, 1882), 2-3, and then in pamphlet form. Bayard, a senator from 1869 until his resignation in 1885 to enter Cleveland's cabinet, provoked Spooner into writing "A Second Letter to Thomas F. Bayard," after the latter read a speech delivered in Brooklyn on April 6, 1884, which appeared in *Liberty,* II (May 17, 1884), 6-7. For Bayard's speech see *Boston Herald,* April 6, 1884; for his senatorial tenure, *Congressional Globe,* 41 Cong., 1 Sess., LXII, 1; *Congressional Record,* 49 Cong., 1 Sess., XVII, 4. For biographical material consult Charles C. Tansill, *The Congressional Career of Thomas Francis Bayard, 1869-1885* (Washington, 1946).

[132] ". . . under the pretence that this instrument gives them the right of all arbitrary and irresponsible dominion over the whole people of the United States, Congress has now gone on, for ninety years and more, filling great volumes with laws of their own device, which the people at large have never read, nor even seen, nor ever will read or see; and of whose legal meanings it is morally impossible that they ever should know anything. Congress

In the summer of 1885 Tucker began the publication of Spooner's *A Letter to Grover Cleveland: On His False, Self-Contradictory, and Ridiculous Inaugural Address,*[134] which ran through 19 lengthy installments and ended shortly after the Haymarket[135] explosion, when the first genuine crisis in American radical activities was precipitated. This was the most elaborate of the summations which he was to contrive, and like his manifestoes addressed to Bayard, synthesized his early contributions with little new material added. To the readers of *Liberty* it was a work of contemporary freshness, and it achieved sufficient popularity among them to warrant publication shortly afterward in book form.[136]

His association with the growing number of Tuckerites stimulated him to even more drastic repudiations of the state. He inveighed against the right of the state to take the life of anyone, or interfere with men's individual private contracts, or erect monopolies of land or money to the benefit of some at the expense of others.[137] He went on to ridicule the concept of "public rights," as he had long before, and several other generalities and platitudes from the Cleveland inaugural speech.[138] He denied the existence of a "public trust," generally cited as the wellspring of authority vested in the presidency, and declared that the devotion to the "public welfare" would inevitably lead to the destruction of men's individual rights under the guise of promoting their prosperity.[139] He reserved his most eloquent contempt for the party system,[140] which he thought a type of game which stimulated artificial relationships of antagonism among men naturally undisposed to belligerency, promoting

---

has never dared to require the people even to read these laws. Had it done so, the oppression would have been an intolerable one; and the people, rather than endure it, would have either rebelled, and overthrown the government, or would have fled the country. Yet these laws, which Congress has not dared to require the people to even read, it has compelled them, at the point of the bayonet, to obey." *Letter to Bayard,* 7. Page citation is from the pamphlet edition.

[133] *Letter to Bayard,* 3-6, 8-10.

[134] The Letter appeared in *Liberty* almost without interruption from June 20, 1885 through May 22, 1886. Its actual writing was completed May 15.

[135] The relations between Tucker and the American anarchists and the Haymarket group are discussed in Chapter VIII.

[136] As a book of 112 pages it came out July 3, 1886 under a slightly different title: *A Letter to Grover Cleveland, On His False Inaugural Address, the Usurpations and Crimes of Lawmakers and Judges and the Consequent Poverty, Ignorance and Servitude of the People.* Citations are from this edition or from the serial articles in *Liberty.*

[137] Spooner, *Letter to Cleveland,* 31-80.

[138] For the text of the President's address see *Congressional Record,* 49 Cong., 1 Sess., XVII, 2-3; James D. Richardson, *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897* (10 vols. Washington, 1898), VIII, 299-303.

[139] *Liberty,* III (June 20, 1885), 2-3; (July 18, 1885), 2; *Letter to Cleveland,* 7-8, 11.

[140] *Liberty,* III (August 15, 1885), 2; (September 12, 1885), 2; (October 3, 1885), 2; (October 24, 1885), 2; *Letter to Cleveland,* 15-16, 22, 24, 27, 30.

synthetic conflict for the purpose of aggrandizing crafty leaders. In no less vigorous manner did he depreciate the activities transpiring in what the President had described as "the halls of national legislation." To Spooner these were mere cockpits to which the lawmakers invited the representatives of all conceivable conflicting interests, where the former might "favor or oppose, . . . according as they can better serve their own personal interests and ambitions by doing the one or the other."[141] At the same time, he commented acidly on the patronizing attitude of the political elements in taking credit for such material prosperity as was enjoyed, while continuing the process of vitiating the efforts of non-political individuals and encouraging an increasing degree of dependence upon the ability of the government, now fully engaged in supplying a favorable state of affairs wherein the favored monopolies might function.[142]

Spooner's death in 1887[143] brought to an end both his pamphleteering and his anonymous contributions to *Liberty* at the time when the nation-wide loose affiliation of anti-government intellectuals was at its peak. With this group his prestige grew with the passing of time, so that some twenty years later, examining their antecedents, those with a historical bent were willing to admit that Spooner's contributions to American anarchism were fully as important as Josiah Warren's.[144] The undecorated egoistic doctrines of Max Stirner were already looming in the writings of the Tucker group, intruding on the earlier basis of anarchist thinking, and altering some of the tenaciously-held concepts, especially those dealing with the abstraction of natural right. The flowering of American anarchism under the leadership of Benjamin Tucker, and the gradual swing to intellectual egoism, is a many-sided and personality-filled account best considered in relation to new circumstances which tended to modify the contributions of its important forerunners.

---

[141] *Liberty,* III (August 15, 1885), 2; *Letter to Cleveland,* 17.

[142] The influence of Tucker's hammering at the monopoly-granting power of the government is evident in the following: ". . . if a government is to 'do equal and exact justice to all men,' it must do simply that and nothing more . . . if it gives monopolies, privileges, exemptions, bounties or favors to any, it can do so only by doing injustice to more or less others. It can give to one only what it takes from others; for it has nothing of its own to give to anyone. No honest government can go into business with any individuals, can give no one any special aid to competition, or protect anyone from competition. It can do no one any favor, nor render to any one assistance which it withholds from another. It must take no cognizance of any man's 'interests.'" *Liberty,* III (August 15, 1885), 3; *Letter to Cleveland,* 15.

[143] A 3½ hour memorial meeting was held in Boston on May 29, 1887, at which one of the speakers was the old abolitionist friend of Spooner, Theodore Dwight Weld. See report of this gathering in *Liberty,* IV (June 18, 1887), 7-8.

[144] See for instance the article "The First American Anarchist" by Clarence Lee Swartz in *Liberty,* XV (February, 1906), 53-54.

CHAPTER VIII

Benjamin R. Tucker and the Age of Liberty I

1. *Intellectual Heir of Native Anarchist Traditions*

The name of Benjamin R. Tucker has of necessity appeared repeatedly in the discussion of the latter years of the pioneer native American anarchists. A full account of none of his predecessors is possible without bringing in the circumstances under which contact with Tucker occurred, since he was to become the synthesizer of their varied thought, and eventually to acquire the reputation of being the most talented speaker and writer of the entire group. Much of his anarchist thought, although derived almost entirely from others, has received the stamp of originality from those unacquainted with the mature influences of his young manhood, while his contributions as a publisher, translator, and literary figure between 1875 and 1908 have been generally overlooked. To understand the imposing prominence of Tucker in the American anarchist propaganda picture during the period of its greatest height, a generous measure of consideration must be given the occasion of his first acquaintances with anti-government thought, and the men whom he cited as the sources of most of his ideas.

Tucker was born in South Dartmouth, Massachusetts, a town adjoining New Bedford, April 17, 1854. He was the son of parents described as "radical Unitarians" of "comfortable circumstances."[1] After attending Friends Academy in New Bedford, he went to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he spent three[2] years in desultory study. He became successively a prohibitionist, a woman suffragist, a supporter of the eight hour movement, and a religious radical. It was in the pages of *The Index* and the *Investigator,* both published locally, that he first learned of materialism and atheism.

---

[1] The best account of Tucker for his early background is still that of George Schumm, "Benj. R. Tucker—A Brief Sketch of His Life and Work," in *The Free Thinkers' Magazine*, XI (July, 1893), 436-440. Also valuable is Steven T. Byington, "Benjamin Ricketson Tucker," in *Man!* VII (August, 1939), 517-518, and *National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, XII, 403, as well as the reminiscences in Joseph Ishill (ed.), *Free Vistas*, II, 261-308. Included are letters and sketches by such associates and acquaintances as George Bernard Shaw, Henry L. Mencken, John William Lloyd, Ernest Armand, George E. MacDonald, Clarence Lee Swartz and Henry Meulen.

[2] Tucker later became irritated because his stay at M. I. T. was often recorded as only two years. For corroboration of the three year duration consult *Who's Who in America* (3rd ed. Chicago, 1903-1905), 1506. Additional biographical information may be found in the following subsequent editions of this work, 4th (1906-1907), 1811; 5th (1908-1909), 1915-1916.

By 1872 his interest in engineering studies lapsed in favor of politics, when he founded a Greeley-Brown Club in New Bedford while still three years too young to vote himself.[3] The year 1872 brought with it another experience, however, which ended his political aspirations and commenced his associations with anarchism. At the spring meeting of the New England Labor Reform League in Boston, he met Josiah Warren and William B. Greene for the first time, and a life-long career as an anti-statist thinker was begun.

In November of this same year Tucker began corresponding with Ezra Heywood. Articles by Tucker, published in *The Word,* brought an acquaintance with this prominent intellectual.[4] Through this paper, primarily, he became familiar with Warren's labor exchange and labor theory of value, Greene's free mutual banking, J. K. Ingalls' land occupation and use, and Heywood's intense literary style. To the ideas of these Americans he added something from Proudhon, Bakunin, Max Stirner and Herbert Spencer, and produced a redoubtable amalgam which proved almost impenetrable through a stormy 27 year period of exposition in the pages of *Liberty.*

In addition, he became friendly with Warren, Spooner, and Greene despite considerable disparity in age.[5] Tucker later called his paper "the foremost organ of Josiah Warren's doctrines"[6] and acclaimed Spooner

---

[3] Schumm, "Benj. R. Tucker," 438.

[4] Wrote Tucker, "I hope to do some work for the Labor Cause but first wish to study the question that I may thoroughly understand it. For this reason I send for your publications. I wish you would hold a convention in New Bedford. The Conservatives here need a little stirring up. They have not been shocked in a long time." *The Word,* I (November, 1872), 3. See also his second dispatch written from 59 Temple Street, Boston, in *The Word,* I (February, 1873), 3.

It is probable that his association with Heywood was responsible for subsequent ties with Victoria Woodhull in the spreading of the left wing brand of feminism associated with her name. He later repudiated her as "a loathesome adventuress" and "a despicable renegade" for her disavowal of all action and propaganda which she had contributed to the "free love" movement, all of which he considered "great and useful work." On the other hand he declared that he had no sympathy for those who "ignorantly abuse her out of mere prejudice against the radical doctrines which she taught." See his article, and reprint of her letter of December 29, 1880 to the London *Court Journal,* in *Liberty,* VI (January 19, 1889), 4. For a much later uncomplimentary estimation of his early association with "The Woodhull," see Sachs, *Victoria Woodhull,* Chapter XII.

[5] Warren was a visitor at Tucker's home at one time. Tucker's devotion to and admiration for Spooner was no less strong. See *Liberty,* VIII (March 21, 1891), 4.

[6] At the time when he was engaged in the publication of his paper *Liberty,* Tucker made a similar dedication to Proudhon: "*Liberty* is . . . a journal brought into existence almost as a direct consequence of the teachings of Proudhon. . . ," designating the French anarchist as the "profoundest political philosopher that has ever lived." *Liberty,* I (January, 1882), 4. For

"one of the profoundest political philosophers that ever added to the knowledge of mankind."[7] He took no credit for originality in his espousal of free banking: "I am indebted to Col. Greene's *Mutual Banking* more than to any other single publication for such knowledge as I have of the principles of finance—the most compact, satisfactory, keen and clear treatise upon mutual money extant."[8] Ingalls was probably the first of the Americans to write for Tucker under his own name,[9] while the expressions of both Andrews and Heywood are present in Tucker's writings, those of the latter especially as the result of close publishing association.[10]

Tucker's first public discussion of his newly-adopted beliefs dealt with the Warren-Greene theory of interest and money. It was, strangely enough, carried in the pages of Francis Abbot's religious *Index,* with the editor himself furnishing the formidable opposition. Although the controversy was a matter almost wholly foreign to the paper, it lasted nearly the entire year of 1873,[11] with little observable result except the introduction of Tucker to a type of polemic which was to become extremely popular in his own journal a decade later. Tucker applied the Warrenite fundamental, that in any exchange of labor[12] or its products exact equivalents must be sought in the transaction, to the act of lending money. Using the term "interest" in the ordinary sense, "a sum of money paid to the lender in return for the benefit conferred upon the borrower," he maintained that "cost to the lender" was all that could equitably or "morally" be taken. He later came to label interest-taking a "crime," as did Heywood. Tucker adopted the latter's fondness for quoting biblical remonstrances against this practice and continually up-

---

the tribute to Warren see *Liberty,* IX (May 27, 1893), 1. Compare the honor given to Proudhon with that accorded Spooner in note below.

[7] *Liberty,* VII (June 28, 1890), 6.

[8] *Liberty,* VI (January 5, 1889), 1.

[9] See Chapter VI, note 38.

[10] Tucker's famous definition of an American anarchist as an "unterrified Jeffersonian Democrat" was a direct borrowing from Heywood. See the latter's work *The Labor Party,* 14, published in 1868, shortly after Tucker's 14th birthday. For the source of Heywood's borrowing see Andrews, *Science of Society* (No. 1), 39.

[11] The letters and replies ran from February through November, 1873. Tucker resented Abbot's explaining to the readers that his opponent was a youth of just 19 years of age; "I cannot see the necessity of calling attention to my age. Many people think the ideas of a young man not worth looking into, and will pay no attention to his argument." *The Index,* IV, 423. A short sketch of Abbot as a freethought publisher may be found in *Who Was Who in America* (Chicago, 1942), 1.

[12] Tucker acquired a respect for Robert Owen through his relations with Warren. See his commemoration of Owen's 111th birthday, "the man who did more perhaps than any other to give impulse to the consideration of industrial wrongs. All friends of labor should unite in doing honor to his memory." *Liberty,* I (May 13, 1882), 1.

Warren's ideas on land were not fully understood by Tucker, and he represented the former as opposed to the purchase and sale of land, which was not so. Compare Tucker's reproach of Warren in *The Word,* III (September, 1875), 3, and Warren, *Equitable Commerce* (a leaflet), 3-4.

braided ministers for failing to stress such social teachings of the scriptures.[13]

Under the influence of Greene, Tucker made the first of several trips to Europe[14] in August, 1874, returning in mid-January of the next year after spending some time in the study of Proudhon's writings in both published and manuscript form. With this background, Heywood engaged him as associate editor[15] of the *Word* in April, 1875, and a long career as an anarchist writer was fully commenced. His direct association with Heywood lasted until December, 1876, during which period he attracted particular attention by two actions. One of these was his quixotic repetition of the celebrated refusal of Henry David Thoreau to pay taxes, a symbolic gesture in the attempt to illuminate his intellectual opposition to taxation by compulsion. On August 9, 1875, Tucker publicly announced his refusal to pay the poll tax of the town of Princeton,[16] Mass., the home of Heywood and the publishing office of the *Word*. Later in the month he was incarcerated in the Worcester County Jail for so doing, but his release took place in short order under anti-climactic conditions.[17] This was his only clash with the machinery of the state during a long period of literary attack upon it. His sympathizers wrote off the incident as "foolhardy" and a consequence of youthful and impetuous idealism.[18]

Of much more importance to the anarchist element was the announcement in January, 1876 of the publication of Tucker's translation of Proudhon's famous *What Is Property?* An octavo tome of 500 pages, it was a serious and worthy contribution for a young man of 21 years of age, and ended his misgivings as to the attention accorded him due to his youth.[19] Henceforth his stature among the anti-statists grew[20] until he became the acknowledged literary power among them.

---

[13] *The Index,* IV, 72; *The Word,* II (May, 1873), 2.

[14] *The Word,* III (September, 1874), 2; IV (November, 1874), 2; (January, 1875), 2.

[15] *The Word,* IV (April, 1875), 2.

[16] *The Word,* IV (August, 1875), 2; (October, 1875), 3.

[17] The tax was paid by a friend of Tucker's, a matter which made him somewhat angry. The identity of the unknown benefactor was never divulged. See long account of the affair in Worcester *Evening Press,* October 26, 1875, reprinted in *The Word,* IV (December, 1875), 2.

In May, 1888, Tucker made another public incident of the poll tax while living in Revere, Mass. He paid it under protest while registering opposition along the new line of giving in before superior force, as exemplified in the tax-collector as the agent of the state. See *Liberty,* V (May 26, 1888), 4.

[18] A letter to *The Word* by William B. Wright exhorted him "not to lose time in martyrdom," suggesting that such a protest had already been done much better by Thoreau, and that Tucker continue his efforts in the line of translation of anarchist works rather than waste his energies in activities of this type. Wright suggested the commencement in the heart of Boston of a Warrenite equity store as a mean of again demonstrating the cost exchange idea, which Warren had done there himself two decades before. *The Word,* (November, 1875), 3-4.

Tucker's restlessness and dissatisfaction with Heywood's policy in conducting the *Word* resulted in his resignation in December, 1876. He charged that Heywood was devoting too much time and space to "love reform," and not enough to "labor reform."[21] "I wish to give myself first and emphatically to the advocacy of justice to labor," announced Tucked as he severed his connections[22] with the Heywood group and began plans for his own venture, the *Radical Review,* the following month.[23]

The *Radical Review* was an undertaking of wide scope and intentions. Its policy was definitely extended in making public the political and economic tenets of American anarchism, and during its short life it became the one organ in which the prominent pioneer expositors were united. Andrews, Spooner, Greene, Heywood and Ingalls all contributed articles of importance and value. Tucker had serious literary ambitions for his journal as well, and a group of other personalities[24] became attached to

---

[19] *The Word,* IV (February, 1876), 2-3. Tucker had apparently been engaged in this for some time. See also his letter to *The Index* of September 9, 1875, commenting on Saint Beuve's discussion of the letters of Proudhon, as an indication of his new interest.

[20] Heywood and Tucker were especially pleased by an acrid review published by the Frankfort (Ky.) *Weekly Yeoman,* which they reprinted prominently; "From a business note in this number, we learn that one of the editors, Mr. Tucker, is the translator of the works of that notorious French Communist (sic) and conspirator Proudhon, which would seem to indicate the poisonous fountain from which he had imbibed the incendiary principles that prompt the unholy . . . crusade he has set out to preach." *The Word,* IV (January, 1876), 2. See also the review by Stephen Pearl Andrews in *The Index,* VII, 291.

[21] The anarchist conception of the term "labor reform" was not that generally understood, which involved the machinery of trade-unionism, strikes, boycotts, arbitration, profit-sharing, limitation of hours, and discussion of such terms as "fair wage" and "harmony between capital and labor." All this they considered "conservative," and would be satisfied with no less than "the abolition of the monopoly privileges of capital and interest-taking, and the return to labor of the full value of its production." Victor Yarros, "Socialist Economics and the Labor Movement," in *Liberty,* V (June 9, 1888), 6. See also the excellent comparison of the two outlooks on the term by Sidney H. Morse, the "Equity School" and the "Political, or Eight Hours School," in *The Word,* IV (April, 1875), 1.

[22] *The Word,* V (December, 1876), 2.

[23] *The Word,* V (January, 1877), 2.

[24] Some of the other contributors were Elie Reclus, Tucker's erstwhile controversialist Abbot, Samuel Longfellow, John Fiske, Octavius B. Frothingham, Edmund C. Stedman, as well as radicals of a variety of persuasions, John Orvis, Henry Edger, William Hanson, Dyer D. Lum, Henry Appleton and Cyrus H. Bartol.

Tucker also began his translation of Proudhon's *System of Economical Contradictions,* which ran as installments in each issue. Tucker published the first volume of this work under his own imprint in 1888, and translated a few chapters of the second volume and sold them separately in paper covers. But he was "never able to complete the work," he wrote to a young bibliophile and admirer nearly fifty years later. Tucker to Ewing C. Baskette, March 28, 1935, Baskette Collection. Proudhon's "best book," in Tucker's opinion, was *General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth* the fortunes of the *Radical Review* during its brief period of publication. Begun in May, 1877,[25] the final number came out in February, 1878. This was probably due more to a personal decision on the part of Tucker than to failure. Ezra Heywood's first conviction under the Comstock laws took place during the summer of 1878. Tucker, anxious to do his part in the struggle to keep the radical periodical press alive, took charge of the *Word* in his absence. Moving its editorial and publication offices to Cambridge, he directed its fortunes from there from August, 1878, until Heywood's release from prison late in December of the same year.[26] In the meantime, Tucker's own venture languished, and it never resumed publication under his name or management.

For over two years thereafter he remained inactive on the propaganda line, although engaged in journalism in Boston as a means of livelihood. The observation that such former stalwarts as Andrews and Heywood were straying away from the "plumb-line" may have impressed upon him the need for a periodical[27] devoted entirely to the dissemination of anarchism rather than every shade of unorthodoxy. At any rate, on August 6, 1881, the first issue of Tucker's famous broadsheet *Liberty* appeared, accompanied by a statement of principle and editorial policy which must have appealed to all the extreme individualist anarchists on his first mailing list:[28]

> It may be well to state at the outset that this journal will be edited to suit its editor, not its readers. He hopes that what suits him will suit them; but if not, it will make no difference. No subscriber, or body of subscribers, will be allowed to govern his course, dictate his policy, or prescribe his methods. *Liberty* is published for the very definite purpose of spreading certain ideas, and no claim will be admitted on any pretext of freedom of speech, to waste its limited space in hindering the attainment of that object.

Century, translated by Tucker's friend John Beverly Robinson and published in English for the first time in 1923. (A new printing of this book appeared in 1969). Tucker to Baskette, November 7, 1934, Baskette Collection.

[25] Tucker was still engaged in his translations of Proudhon; for the *Index* he translated "The Malthusians" from *Le Representant du Peuple* of August 11, 1848, reprinted in *The Index,* VIII (August 30, 1877), 411-412.

Tucker succeeded in acquiring an almost complete file of Proudhon's newspapers, which were subsequently purchased by the University of Michigan and housed in the General Library in Ann Arbor. See editorial note by Tucker in *Liberty,* VIII (July 11, 1891), 1, for acknowledgement to John Henry Mackay, who gathered them for him in Europe.

[26] See *The Word,* VII (August, 1878), 1-2, for an account of the circumstances under which Tucker assumed the editorship of the paper.

[27] Unlike his *Radical Review,* an expensive quarterly, for that time, which had a subscription price of $5 a year, the new venture was apparently nonprofit in nature. The four page broadsheet was published every two weeks, and the 26 annual issues constituted a volume. Commented Tucker, "Formerly the price of Liberty was eternal vigilance, but now it can be had for fifty cents a year." *Liberty,* I (August 6, 1881), 1.

[28] *Liberty,* I (August 6, 1881), page cited above.

It is true that an examination of *Liberty* during its long period of publication reveals that this ideal was only partially realized. Tucker proved to be easily stimulated into argumentation, and numerous pages of *Liberty* were henceforth to be devoted to disputes of many kinds. Much of it was wrangling and hair-splitting of little or no value which in the later days gave the paper the tenor of a debating society. Despite its shortcomings, however, *Liberty* preserved sufficient vitality to become the longest-lived of any radical periodical of economic or political nature in the nation's history, and certainly one of the world's most interesting during the past two centuries.

2. *Theoretical Anarchism Matured*

The crystallization of anarchist thought which took place during the period of Tucker's prominence as the literary focal point of the native American demonstration can be found illustrated in both political and economic senses throughout *Liberty*. Tucker himself, however, left no doubt as to which aspect of the struggle against the state he considered the most important. Production, distribution and exchange were all subjects of long study on his part, and he came to the conclusion that the political and social structures[29] of American culture could better be dealt with after economic problems had been settled. "Liberty, to be effective, must find its first application in the realm of economics," he declared,[30] and on this matter of the economic basis of life he drummed continually.

Tucker's contribution to the thought of his associated anti-statists was his articulate presentation of the concept of the four monopolies which he saw as productive of all the evils of society. The anarchist approach was similar to the general theory of the many-branched socialist movement in that it postulated the existence of an element of surplus wealth. Queried Tucker in his first issue, "Somebody gets the surplus wealth that Labor produces and does not consume. Who is the Somebody?" After a rapid survey of the varied means of obtaining "property," during which such methods as work, gift, discovery, gambling, beggary, and the violent or forceful means of appropriation, as individuals, were all dismissed as effecting the accumulation of but a minor portion of the world's wealth, Tucker, by his process of elimination, inexorably arrived at the culprit, whom he labeled the "usurer." Said Tucker, "There are three forms of usury, interest on money, rent of land and houses, and profit in exchange. Whoever is in receipt of any of these is a usurer." Furthermore, under existing conditions, there hardly lived a single soul who did not come under this classification in one way or another. Not only were bankers, manufacturers, merchants and landlords usurers under this definition, but so were all workingmen who placed their savings in interest-bearing positions, either in banks or elsewhere. Anyone who "exchanges his labor for more than an equivalent" was a "usurer," but those guilty of this and the other economic peculations previously listed did not equally benefit. "Only the chief usurers accumulate," he observed; "in agricultural and thickly-settled countries, the landlord; in industrial and commercial countries, the bankers. Those are the Somebodies who swallow up the surplus wealth."[31]

---

[29] For the discussion of ethical concepts in individualist anarchism, see Chapter IX, Parts 4 and 5.

[30] *Liberty,* VI (September 1, 1888), 5.

To Tucker these were not the effects of natural economic processes but the by-products of privilege,[32] privilege derived from the possession of power and enjoyed by a few. The source of the power he traced to monopoly, a term which he defined in relation to competition.[33] This in turn rested on his interpretations of cost and value, or in his own terms, the "reward of labor," which was two-fold, "scientific" and "actual." In a state of absolutely free competition, these would be practically identical, "the product of an equal amount of equally arduous labor."[34] From this analysis stemmed Tucker's definition of a monopolist:[35]

---

31. See Tucker, "Who Is the Somebody?" in *Liberty,* I (August 6, 1881), 3-4.
32. "The whole loaf rightfully belongs to those who raise the wheat from the soil, grind it into flour, and bake it into bread, and not the smallest taste of it to the sharpers who deceive the unthinking masses into granting them a monopoly of the opportunities of performing these industrial operations, which opportunities they in turn rent back to the people on condition of receiving the other half of the loaf." *Liberty,* I (September 17, 1881), 2.
33. The word "competition" has to be approached from a different point of view in order to understand the anarchist. Under a system of finance capitalism subscription to "free competition" must become lip service only, beyond a certain point, due to the destructive effect upon the price structure. The anarchist is concerned with no such reservation, and wishes to see competition carried out to its logical conclusion, which to him would mean the reduction of all price to zero, theoretically. What the entrepreneur, corporation management or political manager may look upon as "wasteful" or "unnecessary duplication" in business of either productive or distributive nature the anarchist regards as beneficial in the fight against all profit-making. Anarchists of both schools are not inclined to accept the marginal utility theory of value; Tucker declared, "In the absence of monopoly, the price of an article worth producing at all is governed, not by its utility, but by the cost of its production," and only by the most universal application of competition can the lowest possible cost of production of any given article be learned. For this reason Tucker repudiated the "plane of James and William" illustration by which the French economist Bastiat attempted to justify the taking of interest, insisting that regardless of how James' plane increased William's plank production, James could not sell or lend it for more than its cost of production, unless he had a monopoly of the manufacture of planes. *Liberty,* VI (October 13, 1888), 4.

    In anarchist economics, then, "free competition" means the "free and equal access" to raw materials, instruments of production and an absolutely unrestricted market. Granted such circumstances, the anarchist maintains that the price of all goods will tend to approximate "the effort necessary for their production," which is in line with Warren's "cost the limit of price." For an excellent summary of this matter see Labadie, *Anarchism Applied to Economics,* (a leaflet).
34. *Liberty,* III (October 3, 1885), 5.
35. *Liberty,* II (September 6, 1884), 1.

> . . . any person, corporation, or institution whose right to engage in any given pursuit of life is secured, either wholly or partially, by any agency whatsoever—whether the nature of things or the force of events or the decree of arbitrary power,—against the influence of competition.

Despite the leeway granted in this statement, he did not hesitate in locating the monopolies and the sources thereof which created the grave dislocations of economic society. Here he entered his concept of the four monopolies in the creation of which the state was "the chief of sinners," and two of which were by far the most evil, "the monopoly of land and the monopoly of credit." The other two, the monopoly of the tariffs and the monopoly of patents and copyrights, were frankly state-conducted, he said, and completed the process enabling the extraction of profit in exchange. With reference to the first pair of monopolies, Tucker was very explicit:[36]

> Ground-rent exists only because the State stands by to collect it and to protect land titles rooted in force or fraud. Otherwise the land would be free to all, and no one could control more than he used. Interest and house rent exist only because the State grants to a certain class of individuals and corporations the exclusive privilege of using its credit and theirs as a basis for the issuance of circulating currency. Otherwise credit would be free to all, and money, brought under the law of competition, would be issued at cost.

Thus he concluded that "the usurer is the Somebody" and that "the State is his protector," and only the abolition of the power to create such monopolies of land, money, patents and copyrights would ever make it possible for "laborers" to retain the full return from their production. Tucker's writings never neglected this program, the fight against the state as the backbone of monopoly[37] continuing in the pages of *Liberty* for over twenty-five years, and under a number of different forms. For this reason he rejected the reform fight against trusts at a later time, declaring that the trusts existed through the agency of legality in the first place and confining his remedy to the suggestion that the laws creating trusts be repealed, instead of new laws being passed to neutralize the evils resulting from the previous ones.

---

[36] *Liberty,* I (August 6, 1881), 3-4.

[37] Tucker placed his economic program in the form of nine statements in logical order so that readers might understand his viewpoint:

"1. The laboring classes are deprived of their earnings by usury in its three forms, interest, rent and profit.
2. Such deprivation is the principal cause of poverty.
3. Poverty, directly or indirectly, is the principal cause of crime.
4. Usury is dependent upon monopoly, especially of land and money.
5. These monopolies cannot exist without the backing of the State.
6. By far the larger part of the work of the State consists in establishing and sustaining monopolies by special legislation.
7. The abolition of these invasive functions of the State would gradually lead to the disappearance of crime.
8. The disappearance of crime would render the protective functions of State superfluous.
9. Thus the State would have been entirely abolished."

Liberty, I (August 19, 1882), 2.

Of these monopolies, Tucker singled out for his particular attention and life-long attack that of money,[38] or the centralization of the financial system by the federal government. Utilizing the ideas of Greene and Spooner, he evolved an argument which differed little from theirs, though more blunt in its phrasing. "The first point of attack should be the power of legally privileged capital to increase without work. And as the monopoly of the issue of money is the chief bulwark of this power, *Liberty* turns its heaviest guns upon that."[39] State and national banks were looked upon as "law-created and law-protected monopolies," and were "equally objectionable" to the advocates of free banking, whose chief aim was "to secure the right of all wealth to monetization without prior conversion into some particular form of wealth limited in amount and without being subjected to ruinous discounts."[40] He fought the gold standard just as bitterly as had his predecessors, asserting at one time that it was the "king of commodities" and a "privileged product," and that free trade was incomprehensible in a world using it universally. "The nation which absorbs it—that is, the nation whose exports largely exceed its imports—will surely govern the world."[41] Tucker realized that there existed stiff penalties on the statute books to prevent just what he was advocating. In fact, he had himself participated in an effort to have that of Massachusetts repealed while associated with Heywood, to no avail. However, he kept the issue before his readers and critics constantly, despite his failure to suggest a means of by-passing the state.

Writings on finance filled the major part of many single issues of the paper. In fact, little lessening took place in the prominence of the money question among the matters before discussion until the mid-90's, by which time about everything constructive on the subject had been expressed. Tucker argued that everything not labor which played a part in production was capital, and money, being one of these things, was capital.[42] Every kind of wealth had a right to exercise its "natural and legitimate monetary function," and the fact that money was arbitrarily limited in amount was the cause of practically all existing "social injustices." The arbitrary decision as to the actual volume of money acted to keep its total amount below the demand for it, and thus tended to raise the rate of interest.[43] He did not attack the measure or standard[44] of value; without one, arrived at through force, selection or mutual agreement, it mattered not which, the idea of money was "not only impossible, but unthinkable." Security might not be essential to the institution of a money system, he granted. but "it is an essential of steady production and stable commerce." The use of insecure money was a sure road to "general bankruptcy": "When products can be had for the writing of promises and the idea gets abroad that such promises are good money whether kept or not, the producers are very likely to stop producing." The ultimate of all this, then, would be the existence of many more claims upon production in the form of money than there were products to buy with it.[45]

---

[38] "The most fatal restriction upon trade now existing is the monopoly of the issue of money, the fountainhead of all tyrannies in these plutocratic days, and that is where Liberty . . . must strike first to strike effectively." *Liberty,* III (November 22, 1884), 1.

[39] *Liberty,* III (January 9, 1886), 4.

[40] *Liberty,* IV (March 26, 1887), 4.

[41] *Liberty,* I (March 18, 1882), 1.

[42] *Liberty,* IX (August, 1893), 2-3. *Liberty* was now being published monthly in New York, and carried no day of publication.

The need of evidence of security for money through some system of organized credit did not require sanction of some particular commodity as the sole medium with which to keep the promises. Subscribing to the Greene ideas, he thought it perfectly sound to retain the gold or silver dollar, arrived at through agreement on an arbitrary weight in ounces, as a standard. However, the idea of monetizing other commodities with relation to their values as expressed in specie dollars remained topmost in his considerations:[46]

> What the friends of free money are fighting for is the right both of individuals and of coöperators to issue money when and as they choose, and what they are fighting against is the laws which in any way make it impossible for either individuals or coöperators to exercise this right. This, and nothing else, is the free money theory.

The volume theorists with whom Tucker debated maintained that an increase in the amount of money by mutual banking was no solution. As the volume increased, its purchasing power decreased, the ratio of the aggregate purchasing power of money to commodities in exchange remaining unchanged.[47] The Tuckerite mutualists rejoined that such a stand assumed that the volume increase took place at the expense of the standard of value, the backing becoming debased as more money was introduced into the economy. But mutual banking would have no such result. The standard of value would remain the specie dollar, only other

---

43. *Liberty,* VIII (May 16, 1891), 3.
44. "The claim that a standard of value varies, and inflicts damage by its variations is perfectly sound, but the same is true, not only of the standards of value, but of every valuable commodity as well. Even if there were no standards of value, and therefore no money, still nothing could prevent a partial failure of the wheat crop from enhancing the value of every bushel of wheat." *Liberty,* VIII (June 13, 1891), 2.
45. *Liberty,* II (June 28, 1884), 4.
46. *Liberty,* IV (July 30, 1887), 1.
47. Tucker found most of his critics, especially of free money and banking, among the "hard money" men, whom he considered the backbone of the quantity theory. *Liberty,* VI (January 25, 1890), 1.

property than specie would be monetized at the same standard and measure. Therefore the purchasing power of the gold and silver dollars would not be affected. Tucker theorized that the increased distribution would facilitate the distribution of wealth, and the increased distribution would stimulate the demand for more wealth. The increased demand would encourage the increase in production, and therefore, an increase in the abundance of capital. This increase in the abundance of capital would tend to lower interest rates "up to the point where interest disappears entirely."[48] He never lost sight of his primary purpose, the destruction of the ability of capital to return to its owner an income without the application of labor by its owner. Capital was already "rewarded," he declared, merely by its ownership. If the owner was to lend it and the borrower "damages, destroys or consumes" a portion or all of it, then it was the right of the owner to have that fully restored. Any surplus beyond its return "intact," on the other hand, was "payment for a day's work a second time,"[49] for he defined capital as "a day's work already done" and embodied in the form of tangible property. Tucker did not censure the taking of interest as such, but with Proudhon, believed that if the power to take it were extended to all men equally, it would eventually cancel itself out. Its persistence was due, therefore, to the fact that it continued to be a burden upon a portion of society unable to make use of it through the location of the money system in the hands of a monopoly by the state, and which free banking would shatter.[50]

Tucker's philosophical and political ideas covered areas which previously had been little touched upon by his predecessors, in contrast to his convictions relating to money, credit and banking. A deep strain of religion had remained in the conclusions of all the prominent previous exponents excepting Warren. Tucker, reflecting the influence of Michael Bakunin and other continentals, brought the issue out resolutely in asserting that anarchism, as an impetus toward the realization of liberty and freedom, necessarily had to conduct the fight against authority everywhere. He saw the church and state as twin forces whose outlines remained, even in those who felt no qualms in making the most outspoken specific criticism of them in operation in particular areas of human society. "The purpose of liberty, boiled down to its ultimate essence, is the abolition of authority," he summarized, and no headway would be made toward this goal as long as there remained the belief that authoritarian institutions of some kind were necessary. Church and state he conceived as a "double-headed monster" which maintained itself by keeping the masses of the people "drugged with the superstititious reverence for the fiction of authority."[51]

---

[48] *Liberty,* VII (July 26, 1890), 4.

[49] *Liberty,* IV (July 16, 1887), 4.

[50] *Liberty,* I (October 29, 1881), 3. Tucker believed that to forbid the taking of interest interfered with the right of persons to make any contracts they pleased, even those stipulating the payment of interest. To defend the right of contract did not mean that interest-taking was held to an "equitable transaction"; "In defending the right to take usury, we do not defend the right of usury." *Liberty,* I (January 7, 1882), 3.

It was his conviction that the fight against the church was being won, but that its power was being absorbed by the state, with even more serious consequences. Of the three forms of authority which threatened liberty, that of the Christian churches and their offshoot autocracy was the less to be feared and parliamentarianism and the authoritarian socialism of Karl Marx the more dangerous. It was in the latter two that he observed the transference of worship from the supernatural to the organs of the state:[52]

> It is human authority that hereafter is to be dreaded, and the State, its organ, that in the future is to be dreaded. Those who have lost their faith in gods only to put it in governments, those who have ceased to be Church-worshippers only to become State-worshippers; those who have abandoned pope for king or czar; and priest for president or parliament; —have indeed changed their battle ground, but none the less are foes of liberty still.

Thus Tucker, finding the core of authoritarianism laid deep in the origins of theocracy, came to the conclusion that for his own time the emphasis had changed: "This century's battle is with the State," was his blunt estimation of the issue. Like Spooner and Warren, he repudiated the idea of society as possessing personality. "Society is not a person or a thing but a relation, and a relation can have no rights"; society consisted of individuals, and only individuals possessed rights.[53] The greatest right he thought men might hold was liberty, equally held by each. "Equal liberty," he explained, "means the largest amount of liberty compatible with equality and mutuality of respect, on the part of indi-

---

51. *Liberty,* I (August 20, 1881), 2-3. On one occasion Tucker commented, "We anarchists are political abolitionists. We earnestly desire the abolition of the State." *Liberty* I (August 19, 1882), 2.

52. *Liberty,* I (August 6, 1881), 2. It was Tucker's point that there was no logical stopping place, once the individual began the process of rejecting authority, short of total rejection and the counter-assertion of "self-sovereignty"; "The man who clings to that superstition known as the State, and boasts of having flung away the fetters of theology and priest-craft, does not understand himself."

It is important to note that Tucker was not attacking religion as a personal guide of conduct; "We intend no disrespect to God as an ideal that any individual may hold dear. Any fancy or principle which may be formed into an ideal for the better conduct of life, provided such God assumes no authority over others, may be entertained without our protest. It is God the office-seeker and office-holder with whom we take issue, and it is only such a God that makes the politician possible." *Liberty,* I (August 19, 1882), 3.

53. *Liberty,* III (March 6, 1886), 1. Said Tucker ten years before: "In my view, the State is the result of a compact made between individuals in their individual capacities, and not as members of society. The duties of the indvidual to society are of a general nature, which each individual must define for himself." *The Word,* IV (February, 1876), 2.

viduals living in society, for their respective spheres of action."[54] Tucker felt that the basis of anarchism rested on this concept, which he described elsewhere as "the greatest amount of liberty compatible with equality of liberty, the fundamental law of social expediency,"[55] after contact with Stirner's teachings had convinced him that the concept of natural rights was false, and contract a far more satisfactory basis upon which to erect a sound human social system.

Of the prominent American anarchist writers, Tucker was the most careful in defining his terms, especially the expressions "the State," and "government." "The anarchist defines government as invasion, nothing more or less," he stated flatly, while considering the impasse resulting from critics failing to understand anarchist terminology. "Protection against invasion, then, is the opposite of government. Anarchists, in favoring the abolition of government, favor the abolition of invasion, not protection against invasion."[56] Granting the right of individuals and voluntary associations the right to resist invasive behavior on the part of others, he continued, did not imply sanction of the state as one of these associations. On the contrary, anarchists everywhere saw the state only as a compulsory, usurpatory institution, "whose real purposes are offense and invasion; an institution to which all are forced to belong and which all are compelled to support."[57] The philosophy of equal liberty as advanced by anarchists did not preclude "regulation," but regulation which might be thought necessary should come from "selection and voluntary assent." The security of life and property, which, said Tucker, appeared to be the pretext under which government theoretically was established, actually served to invite the circumvention of the "normal processes of Nature" by the utilization of "artificial expedients." Here he made a distinction, at a later time, between voluntary contracts and the assumption of authority and exercise of power on the understanding that consent had been tendered.[58] It was his conviction that society merely reflected the general intercourse of individuals in what he chose to call "experimental association," and that it was and would continue to remain very fluid, depending upon whether or not "artificial intervention" took place. When it did, it sought its expression through the exercise of authority, and this, said Tucker, in its organized phase, was "government." The reduction in liberty resulting from this change in the conduct of affairs was inevitably increased. "The most lamentable spectacle today," he observed, "is the short sighted reformer attempting to secure greater liberty by advocating the method of greater authority, more intervention, more government."[59]

---

[54] *Liberty,* V (June 9, 1888), 5.

[55] Still another definition was this: "Liberty is simply and solely the *freedom and power to choose.* As long as moral philosophers . . . keep on trying to conceal this, the true ideal of Liberty, behind such misleading phrases as the "liberty to do right" and such hackneyed and irrational discrimination as that between "liberty and license," we do not mean to often lose a chance to bring it to light." *Liberty,* I (February 4, 1882), 4. Stress is Tucker's.

[56] *Liberty,* V (January 28, 1888), 5. This was not meant to appear that Tucker was a non-resistant; on the contrary, he fully endorsed the use of force in protecting one's person from "invasion." Even the taking of life under such circumstances he thought not inconsistent, even though he refused to give assent to the right of capital punishment vested in the state. On the personal level, however, he stuck to his declaration that the invader forfeited any consideration from the invaded; "I insist that there is nothing sacred in the life of an invader." *Liberty,* VII (August 30, 1890), 4.

[57] *Liberty,* I (September 16, 1882), 2.

[58] Tucker showed the influence of Spooner on this point, arguing that taking part in the functions of government, such as voting, bearing arms, paying taxes and serving on juries was merely "presumptive evidence" of consent;

Before the state or its visible element the government could disassociate from its long-established role of coercive agent, it had to abandon what Tucker called "The primary act of invasion," the collection of taxes by force. This act, along with the legal sanction granted monopoly development, composed the primary invasive practices of the state, and when both were abandoned as policies, then the peoples of all countries could look forward to a change in social conditions "far more efficiently protective against invasion than any machinery of restraint." The abolition of compulsory taxation would mean the abolition of the state as well, Tucker asserted, and the form of society succeeding it would be on the line of a voluntary defensive institution, prevented from becoming invasive through threats of deprivation of contributions from its members. Thus the demand of the members of the group would act as a device for keeping down the scope of its organization, and make difficult the growth of agencies within itself vying for power.[60]

In the matter of taxation, Tucker from the beginning advised a program of resistance to payment, in an effort to determine the extent to which the government would go in the process of collection. It was his conviction that if one-fifth of any given nation's people were to resist taxation, the cost of collection would be greater than the remaining four-fifths would consent to pay, and thus bring its conduct to a crisis.[61] Any other course of behavior than passive resistance was frowned on, however. The old concept of spontaneous revolution and armed resistance was outmoded in the new era of military discipline; improved firearms and artillery relegated all this to the past. In fact, he was unable to conceive any force succeeding other than that of passive resistance by inoffensive people, refraining from providing even the provocation of public demonstrations.

In fact, Tucker was not concerned with the abolition of the existing state, either in his own land or elsewhere. His preoccupation was with

---

"By what right am I thrust into the alternative of recognizing the machinery of the State as the only chance left me of rescuing my life, liberty, and possessions from invasion?" *Liberty,* II (December 9, 1882), 2.

[59] *Liberty,* I (August 6, 1881), 2.

[60] *Liberty,* VII (November 1, 1890), 4.

[61] *Liberty,* II (October 4, 1884), 5.

the concept of the state as an institution, and he became more and more convinced that it never would be disturbed by such measures as armed rebellion. His concern was with the creation of "some considerable measure and solid weight of absolute and well-grounded disbelief in it as an institution." In its absence, an existing state might be overthrown, but another was sure to rise in its place, and this would be perfectly natural, due to the fact that the belief in its necessity would remain undamaged by mere demonstration of force. The job of the anarchist, said Tucker, was "to create a public sentiment" rendering the collection of taxes, or any other act construed as invasion, either extremely difficult or impossible. The state was "an instrument of aggression," and its demise would be brought about only by individuals who by their various acts of non-coöperation and obstruction could "succeed in stripping the State of its invasive powers." This, said Tucker, was the very best any anarchist might hope to bring about.[62]

Tucker was as convinced of the ineffectiveness of the ballot as he was of the bayonet and bullet. Even Spooner did not exceed him in his deprecation of the system of government by majority rule. No people should delegate power of any dimension which could not be revoked by any "interested individual." "Personal government is the only true government," he declared. The laws of a majority might be fully as destructive to liberty as those of a royal tyrant. The people living under a system of majority legislation should not be blind to the fact, he pointed out, that "the thing done" was not absolved by "the form of doing."[63] Tucker held that boss rule was the inevitable outcome of the voting process, and its continuation merely perpetuated the very evils its reformers sought to check. The anarchist could not countenance the principle that the majority might rule the minority through the ballot box; "the oppression housed in ballot boxes is the same deadly genius that lurks in the palace," pronounced the new intellectual leader of the native American anti-statists.[64] Furthermore, persons securing power through the ballot were no more immune to arbitrary exercise of that power than any other. If any single reason for Tucker's opposition to the voting procedure stood out, it was the conviction that the office corrupted the man, and that all those performing the function of governing resembled each other within a short time, regardless of the principles entertained by one or the other prior to taking office.[65]

---

[62] "Our purpose is the abolition, not only of all existing States, but the State itself. . . . It is not a thing that can be especially defined by Russia, Germany, Great Britain or Massachusetts. The State is a principle, a philosophical error in social existence. The State is chaos, rioting under the guise of law, order and morality. . . . The State is not government, since it denies Liberty. The State becomes impossible the moment you remove from it the element of compulsion." *Liberty,* I (April 15, 1882), 2-3. For further development of this argument see especially the discussions in *Liberty,* IV (July 16, 1887), 5; V (October 22, 1887), 4.

[63] *Liberty,* II (October 14, 1882) 2.

[64] *Liberty,* I (September 16, 1882), 3.

Of the many types of criticism which he received during the dissemination of his convictions, Tucker was the most vulnerable to those which reproached him for his program of destructive criticism, accusing him of offering no suggestions in the way of a substitute for the existing system of government which he so abominated. Of many well-conceived replies the following is characteristic:[66]

> Now, so far from not offering anything in the place of what is now falsely called government, we have something very tangible to offer,—something very rational, practical, and easy of application. We offer coöperation. We offer non-compulsive organization. We offer associative combination. We offer every possible method of voluntary social union by which men and women may act together for the furtherance of well-being. In short, we offer voluntary scientific socialism in the place of the present compulsory unscientific organization which characterizes the State and all of its ramifications . . .

There were two methods of government, said Tucker. One was that of "drivership," the coercive conduct of the state in forcing the individual where he did not willingly wish to go. The other was the anarchist method of "leadership," inducing the individual towards the "goal of an ideal civilization" through persuasion and "attraction."[67] All suggested re-organization of society fell within these two broad categories: "Government, Archism, invasion, are used as equivalent terms; whoever invades, individual or State, governs, and is an Archist; whoever defends against invasion, individual or voluntary association, opposes government and is an Anarchist."[68]

Under Benjamin Tucker's direction, then, we find a synthesis of the many strains of objection to government voiced by his predecessors and teachers, with the accent placed heavily upon the economic factors responsible for buttressing the strength of the arms of government. Two aims of anarchist activity, the abolition of compulsory taxation and the abolition of legally-protected money and land monopolies, form the main theme of his critical writing, and of nearly 50 associates, resulting in the production of an astonishing volume of literature for over three decades. Summarized Tucker on behalf of his compatriots:[69]

> The Anarchists believe . . . that the greater part, if not all, of the necessity for the existence of the State is the result of an artificial limitation of the freedom of civil society, and that the completion of industrial freedom may one day so harmonize individuals that it will no longer be necessary

---

[65] *Liberty,* VI (September 15, 1888), 1.
[66] *Liberty,* II (October 14, 1882), 2.
[67] *Liberty,* I (May 27, 1882), 2.
[68] *Liberty,* V (August 27, 1887), 1.
[69] *Liberty,* VI (June 8, 1889), 4.

> to provide a guarantee of political freedom . . . it is undeniable that the most important freedoms, those without which all other freedoms are of little or no avail, the freedom of banking and the freedom to take possession of unoccupied land, exist nowhere in the civilized world; that the existing State . . . is unquestionably based upon a compulsory tax that is itself a denial of equal freedom, and is daily adding to ponderous volumes of statutes the bulk of which are either sumptuary and meddlesome in character or devised in the interest of privilege or monopoly.

3. *Tucker, the Radicals, and Reform*

Liberty under the editorship of Tucker was a vehicle for many things besides the precise definition of anarchism and its aims. As the organ of a segment of intellectual radicalism of more than ordinary articulation, it carried much material of both sympathetic and critical nature referring to other portions of the whole movement for economic change after 1880. Thus Tucker's writings furnish many illuminations of the anarchist attitude toward the various radical groups of his day; the Social Democrats, nihilists, socialists, communists, Single Taxers, as well as the labor unions, and lesser-known fragments of reform sentiment. A study of the relations between Tucker and these other groups illustrates the development of divergent paths as well, demonstrating the reason for the failure of establishment of any radical common front.

It is interesting to note that no differentiation was made in the beginning between the European and American exponents of anarchism. Tucker considered theirs a common fight against reaction at first, and gave the activities especially of the Russians a great amount of publicity and sympathy. Tucker personally gave evidence of having been strongly influenced by Michael Bakunin's *God and the State,* which he sold in its French edition until exhausted, then translated it into English, a landmark in anarchist propaganda.[70] The picture of Sophie Perovskaya, assassin of Czar Alexander II, was prominently displayed on the first page of *Liberty's* initial issue, and an undisguised program of apology for the actions of the Russian nihilists was featured for over three years thereafter.

The enthusiasm for Peter Kropotkin was no less marked, as well as for Eliseé Reclus, and Kropotkin's Swiss anarchist paper, *Le Révolte.* Tucker regarded them as "among the most prominent anarchists in Europe," and the paper "the most scholarly Anarchist journal in existence."[71] He devoted the whole issue of *Liberty* of February 17, 1883 to the trial in Lyons, France of Kropotkin and 51 fellow anarchists, an event which he accused the English language press of covering up. "Anarchism knows no frontiers," he declared, prophesying "grave troubles" if the Russian ex-nobleman and his compatriots were convicted.[72]

---

[70] Tucker's first expression of admiration for Bakunin appeared in *Liberty* in the fall of 1881. A 4½ by 5 inch reproduction of an engraving of a photograph of Bakunin was featured on the front page of the ninth issue of the paper, November 26, 1881, plus a full page biographical sketch. The following spring he offered for sale a lithograph and biographical sketch of the famous Russian radical. In the summer of 1882 he began selling Bakunin's *Dieu et l'Etat,* but apparently sold out the edition very soon. He offered the work in an English edition for the first time in October, 1883, and had reached the sixth edition by 1888. Although he later changed his estimate of Bakunin, claiming that he was really a communist, along with Kropotkin, there was no criticism of *God and the State. Liberty,* I (November 12, 1881), 1; (July 22, 1882), 4; II (October 6, 1883), 1; V (January 28, 1888), 7.

Numerous other prominent Continental revolutionaries of anarchist persuasions received publicity and friendly support from Tucker. Tucker wrote an indignant condemnation of the Italian government when the anarchist Amilcare Cipriani received a 25 year prison sentence in the spring of 1882. The rise of the Italians Errico Malatesta and Carlo Cafiero as anti-statist journalists was noted with pleasure, and widespread attention was given to the Paris trial of another woman of note among their number, Louise Michel.[73] Tucker personally undertook the establishment of a Boston fund collection agency for a group of Russian nihilist refugees in Paris led by Vera Sassulich and Pierre Lavroff. He welcomed the arrival in the United States of Leo Hartmann, instigator of the so-called Moscow Mine Conspiracy. He even saw fit to speak approvingly of the entry at New York of his subsequent bitter enemy Johann Most, the fiery German instigator.[74]

Dazzled temporarily by the very concept of rebellion, Tucker's defense of its many facets was indiscriminate for some time, despite an indication that he already noticed differences, and occasionally mildly reproved the sanction of certain courses by the Europeans. "It is reverence for office," he wrote, "that has kept . . . and still nurtures that foul ulcer, czardom, on the face of humanity, which the Nihilists alone are ready to tear out by the roots, and bury out of sight forever. Success to the Nihilists! They are the only men and women in Russia who do not assent."[75] Tucker justified their use of dynamite as a measure in self-defense. He reduced the whole conduct of the struggle with the

---

71. Benjamin R. Tucker, *Anarchism or Anarchy, a Discussion Between William H. Tillinghurst and B. R. Tucker, 10.* Although Tucker thought *Le Révolte* worthy of great praise, and reprinted articles from it constantly during the first two years of *Liberty,* the Swiss paper rejected him as a "bourgeois." *Liberty,* I (August 6, 1881), 1; II (July 26, 1884), 4.
72. *Liberty,* II (February 17, 1883), 2-4; I (April 15, 1882), 1.
73. *Liberty,* I (September 3, 1881), 1; (October 1, 1881), 1; II (July 21, 1883), 2-4. For Tucker's remarks on the release of Louise Michel from prison in Paris in January, 1886, see *Liberty,* III (February 6, 1886), 1, 8.
74. *Liberty,* I (August 6, 1881), 1; (January 21, 1882), 1; II (March 18, 1882), 2. Tucker enthusiastically approved of plans for the celebration of the 11th anniversary of the Paris Commune as "one of the grandest of revolutionary announcements." *Liberty,* I (February 18, 1882), 1. For the announcement of arrival of Most and his scheduled speaking engagement in Cooper Union, see *Liberty,* II (December 9, 1882), 1.
75. *Liberty,* I (September 17, 1881), 1.

czar's police to a contest of "force used for oppression versus force used for resistance," and saw great potentialities in the publicity which the anarchist cause was obtaining through their "propaganda of action." Describing it as "an investment in sacrificed tyrants," he went on to point out that media previously closed to them were now accepting and publishing articles on socialism, anarchism, and communism which had not long before been consigned to waste baskets. An enormous amount of investigation and discussion was the other prominent result, while the "masses" were gradually realizing, he believed, "that emperors and prime ministers have no more right to murder their subjects than the latter have to murder them."[76]

Tucker met the revival of the International Working People's Association in London, July 16, 1881 with undisguised enthusiasm, showing especial satisfaction over its re-establishment in accordance with "strictly anarchistic principles." A note of doubt tempered his ardor for the cause, nevertheless, as he showed apprehension over the decision to subordinate the program of intellectual propaganda to that of direct action. "A revolution, to be permanent, must first be mental," he warned. This observation did not prevent Tucker from strongly supporting the "Socialistic-Revolutionary Congress" held in Chicago on October 21-23 that same year for the purpose of forming an American federation of the I.W.P.A. He recommended that all "Socialistic groups weary of compromise," and desiring "to accomplish the social revolution by means other than political action," send notice of attending to August Spies. J. H. Swain, *Liberty's* representative at the meeting, reported a "cordial reception" of "Josiah Warren's American socialism," and also the selection of *Liberty* as the English language organ of the new group.[77]

Two events in America were to shatter the solidarity which did exist between the Tuckerites and the Europeans. One of these was the ill-fated Pittsburgh "Anarchist Congress" of October, 1883, and the other the Haymarket affair. These occurrences split the anti-statists asunder, and a reconciliation on any basis at all never took place thereafter. The steps which led to the widening of the breach between the two wings deserve close attention, since the theoretical dispute has been carried on in the respective journals to this day. Although Tucker later interpreted anarchism of the period after 1880 as a revolt against "state socialism," and the twofold path taken by anarchists a result of the Jurassian Federation meeting of the same year, the American incidents accomplished the separation of the Tuckerite "anti-authoritarians" from the "Kropotkinians."[78]

---

76. *Liberty,* III (February 28, 1885), 1; II (May 12, 1883), 2.
77. *Liberty,* I (August 20, 1881), 2; (November 12, 1881), 4. Tucker was impressed with the I. W. P. A.'s program of "anarchistic socialism" in Europe, singling out Spain in particular as a land where anarchism was especially appealing to working people. *Liberty,* I (November 26, 1881), 2.
78. See Tucker's analysis in *Liberty,* XIII (May, 1897), 4.

The arrival of Most in America signalled the beginning of an energetic anarchist press advocating the program of the European Social Revolutionaries, with the stress on inflammatory addresses and exhortations to violence. The most sensational of these was the German language paper *Freiheit,* edited by Most himself in New York. A second was *The Alarm,* published by A. R. Parsons in Chicago. A third was *Truth,* emanating from San Francisco under the direction of Burnette G. Haskell. Along with Kropotkin's *Révolte,*[79] these formed the intellectual fare of a growing number of radicals whose bent was in the direction of direct action. This, in addition to the avowed support of re-organization of society along communal lines of decentralism,[80] alienated Tucker and other American individualists, who found the attempt to specify formulae for social organization extremely distasteful. Although favoring the discarding of political states, Tucker was convinced that free choice was the only basis for determining the new social order. It was his belief that the cardinal plank of the Social Revolutionaries should be that "in all subsequent social coöperation no manner of organization or combination whatsoever shall be binding upon any individual without his consent,"[81] and to decide in advance upon a communal structure violated this maxim from the start.

The attempt of Haskell to bring about a convention which would succeed in "reconciling the various schools of Socialists," as Tucker phrased it, was described by the latter as "perhaps the most foolishly inconsistent piece of work that ever came to our notice." A few days before the scheduled date of meeting, October 14, 1883, Tucker advised the individualists through the columns of *Liberty* that they should exercise great caution in examining any document brought before the group before indicating assent by signing. He called Haskell's plan "specious and plausible" but resolutely stated that he would not be a partner to such a "marriage."[82] This brought to a head a controversy between the two which had begun at an earlier time, when Tucker had berated Haskell's policy of printing long excerpts from the works of Marx, Proudhon, Bakunin and other socialists and anarchists without any attempt at discrimination or interpretation, in the hope of creating the impression of their essential sameness.[83]

---

[79] Tucker had long been aware that there were different approaches to the philosophy of anarchism; in 1881 he had noted that Cafiero and Malatesta held "communism in anarchy as the social ideal," but did not feel it worthy of a definite discriminatory stand. Three years later he did designate Most and *Le Révolte* as belonging to the school of "anarchist communists," and not of his kind. However, he condemned the suspension of Kropotkin's paper by the Swiss authorities, and regretted that the other wing had lost this vigorous journal. *Liberty,* I (September 3, 1881), 1; II (May 17, 1884), 1; III (February 28, 1885), 4.

[80] Tucker rejected the Lyons manifesto at the time of the Kropotkin trial which declared equality to be a "primary condition to liberty." Equality was a state of affairs which would have to be imposed, he objected, and hence meant a return to authority. Communal ownership also meant coercion; "Products can be rightfully possessed only by individuals and voluntary associations. The community, if it is anything, is a compulsory association, and can never possess anything except by the thief's title." *Liberty,* III (February 28, 1885), page cited above.

[81] *Liberty,* II (October 14, 1882), 2.

[82] Tucker examined this document, which had some circulation previous to the actual convention. See his notice in *Liberty,* II (October 6, 1883), 1.

The split with Haskell was never healed. Anarchist journals lined up along the theoretical lines of individualists or communists thereafter, with occasional concessions to the views of the other side. Tucker gave his rivals plenty of space in *Liberty,* but no longer shared any exhilaration over their struggle. Now he became careful to point out any doctrinal differences to an almost painful degree, as for example at the time of the publication of Eliseé Reclus' *An Anarchist on Anarchy.*[84] At this time also began his continued emphasis on the primacy, from the point of view of time, of the American, or "mutualist" anarchists. Newer opposition anarchist papers spoke of Tucker as the "pope" of the movement,[85] although occasionally there were organs of anarchist communism which took no offense at his stand. Said one, "Tucker is a logical man, and as long as he retains his present opinion of Communism, he can't logically call us anarchists. Certainly no paper that I know of has exposed the shams, humbugs and crimes of our present miscalled social order more ruthlessly than *Liberty.*"[86]

The circumstances connected with the Haymarket affair completed the job of destroying the ties between Tucker, the Americans and the revolutionary groups of both native and immigrant origin. The rift developed somewhat in advance of 1886, despite Tucker's original glance of favor at the arrival of Most from England, where he had been recently imprisoned. It was Henry Appleton, an editorial associate of Tucker, who led the attack upon both Haskell and Most. Appleton named them specifically as leaders of "a class of ranting enthusiasts who falsely call themselves anarchists," who never had repudiated the idea upon which the state had been founded. They proposed to follow the overthrow by violence of the existing order with the establishment of even more repressive centralization. Most he dismissed as "a quack masquerading as an anarchist," opposed to the prevailing system, but wishing to supplant it by a machine backed by force of his own particular brand. Sincerely convinced, as was Tucker, that human institutions had to evolve and should be allowed to do so, Appleton charged that Most, no more than other believers in government, wanted to "institute." He condemned communism of all types as "at war with nature," and the natural enemy of anarchism. Most, he declared, occupied a "ridiculous position"; "a Communist sailing under the flag of Anarchism is as false a figure as could be invented."[87]

---

[83] *Truth* was published from January 28, 1882 through the issue of December, 1884. Haskell later became editor of another short-lived labor paper, the Denver *Labor Enquirer.* On the shortage of funds leading to the discontinuation of the former paper see Burnette G. Haskell to John Francis Bray, February 2, 1885, Bray MSS., Labadie Collection.

Haskell and Tucker were embroiled over the refusal of Haskell to print an advertisement of Tucker's translation of *God and the State* because it contained an attack on Marx. *Liberty,* II (October 6, 1883), 2-3; (December 15, 1883), 4. Tucker believed that *Truth* was responsible for the term "Boston Anarchists," which became applied to the individualist group. *Liberty,* IV (June 19, 1886), 5.

[84] *Liberty,* II (May 31, 1884), 2; (June 14, 1884), 6-7; V (September 10, 1887), 1.

[85] See for instance the comment by Sigismund Danielewicz, editor of the communist-anarchist paper, *The Beacon,* II (January 31, 1891), 2-3. Tucker was amused by these designations, but disavowed plotting to set himself up as the last word on anarchism. "I am not the owner of anarchism. I do not believe in property in ideas. Anarchism existed before me as it will exist after me. I can only interpret it for myself." *Liberty,* XI (November 30, 1895), 3.

[86] *Solidarity,* I (April 1, 1895), 4. Continued John H. Edelmann, the editor and author of this critique, with reference to *Liberty,* "It appeals more to the educated, professional classes than we do, and is for that reason more given to abstract discussion. But it is certain that just these classes must become radical before we can hope for success."

Up to the eve of the Chicago tragedy, Tucker had refrained from taking the initiative in the intellectual struggle between the two factions, despite his assumption of responsibility for Appleton's attacks. On March 27, 1886, however, Tucker came out with a full page condemnation of Most and the New York Germans. He accused Most of shielding the fact that the German section of the I. W. P. A. and members of the Social Revolutionary group were setting fire to their property for the purposes of collecting the insurance premiums. He called upon every "honorable" newspaper in the country, especially those of anarchists, to place this matter before their readers, and declared that it was up to Most to repudiate these arsonists and sever their connections with *Freiheit* in the interests of the movement. Lashed Tucker, "It is one thing to kill the Czar of Russia; it is quite another . . . to set fire to a tenement house containing hundreds of human beings."[88]

This incident created a tremendous scandal in radical circles, and the public press received it avidly. Despite Most's denial of any relation with the matter, and counter charges of petty motives in making the exposé, Tucker held to his original stand tenaciously. On April 17, he replied, "I have nothing to retract. On the contrary, I reiterate all my charges as emphatically as before."[89] He felt that he would be vindicated by subsequent investigation, which for the most part did substantially corroborate the charges made in *Liberty*.

---

[87] For a summary of Appleton's critical articles see *Liberty*, II (September 16, 1884), 4; III (April 25, 1885), 4; (October 3, 1885), 4. See also Haskell's defense addressed to Tucker in *Truth*, I, new series, 283-284.

[88] *Liberty*, III (March 27, 1886), 8; Benjamin R. Tucker, "John Most et Benjamin R. Tucker," in *L'Ere Nouvelle*, III, 3rd series, 92-95.

[89] *Liberty*, IV (April 17, 1886), 4. For an account of the matter sympathetic to Most, see Rudolf Rocker, *Johann Most, das Leben eines Rebellen*, 298-302.

It was in this atmophere of perturbation that the bomb throwing incident took place,[90] followed by the arrest of the celebrated defendants in Chicago and Most himself in New York, all of whom bore the taint of close association with the inflammatory German-language revolutionary press. Tucker's sympathy for the accused men pushed aside all other considerations for the time being. Rushing to the defense of Most as quickly as he had condemned him four weeks earlier, he described the latter as "a victim of authority-ridden maniacs," and professed to be far more impressed by the "violence of the agencies of the state" than by the action of the "Chicago Communists," especially noting the severe condemnation of the clergy, newspapers and police, "shameful in the savagery of their reaction."[91]

In other affairs connected with the case, Tucker was inclined to disbelief of both the stories of the police and of August Spies, Fielden and Albert Parsons. Convinced that the accused were innocent, he advanced the opinion that the person who had thrown the deadly bomb had been seeking an opportunity to do so, since it was not customary to carry such arms on one's person. Thus the argument that the absence of police provocation would have prevented its discharge was an unwarranted assumption. Despite his great respect for Spies and Parsons, Tucker believed that Adolph Fischer alone of the eight accused men was an anarchist; the others were merely "State Socialists" masquerading as such.[92]

Tucker was, in fact, far more interested in the psychological problem which the actions of the Chicago revolutionaries and of Most presented the radical cause as a whole. The general inadvisability of armed revolt, the day of which he believed was gone forever due to the ease with which it could be suppressed, he considered amply proven. There was no doubt in his mind as to the righteousness of resistance to oppression by recourse to violence, but his concern now was with its expedience; "Bloodshed in itself is pure loss." Now he was absolutely convinced that the desired social revolution would be possible only through the utility of peaceful propaganda and passive resistance, for to use violence was merely to mark time, historically. Hence the lack of vigor in defending the Haymarket group:[93]

---

[90] *Liberty's* issues for the month of May, 1886 appeared on the 1st and 22nd, so that Tucker's comments on Haymarket had the benefit of two weeks' observation of the developments surrounding the case.

[91] *Liberty,* IV (May 22, 1886), 4.

[92] *Liberty,* IV (February 26, 1887), 1. See also Fischer's letter of February 1, 1887 to Dyer D. Lum, from the Cook County Jail, on page 6 of this same issue.

Tucker professed to have been impressed by the "heights of rational and moral culture attained by August Spies and Albert Parsons." *Liberty,* V (August 4, 1888), 1. Tucker had been corresponding with Parsons on the subject of anarchism long before Haymarket. *Liberty,* I (March 4, 1882), 1.

[93] *Liberty,* IV (June 19, 1886), 4-5.

> The Chicago Communists have chosen the violent course, and the result is to be foreseen. Their predicament is due to a resort to methods that *Liberty* emphatically disapproves. As between them and the State, *Liberty's* sympathies are with them. But as they by their folly are doing their utmost to help the State, *Liberty* cannot work with them or devote much energy to their defense.

Tucker's actual conduct belied his negative declarations, few radical publications devoting as much space to the defense of the accused men as did *Liberty.* Copious references to the case continued to appear for over ten years thereafter, and he never discarded his conviction that the men were innocent. His only reproach was on the grounds of the incendiary language of their literature and journals, which was a direct invitation to the state to retaliate in the manner which had transpired. The feud with Johann Most continued unabated after the latter's release from jail, and the bitterness toward Most never disappeared from his writing. "The revolutionary Communism which Most has preached is as far removed from Anarchism as Catholicism," observed Tucker, while Most labeled the individualist philosophy as "Tuckerism."[94] It was Most's conviction that Tucker, by his insistence upon private property, was sanctioning the exploitation of labor, since he did not think the concept compatible with mass production. Along with his rejection of Tucker's esteemed mutual banking scheme, such attitudes earned him a degree of coolness which survived him and which the newcomers Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman inherited and felt as long as Tucker continued active in radical journalism.[95]

Tucker's condemnation of the programs of Most and Kropotkin was far milder than the protracted assault aimed at the various groups of Marxian and other socialists. Some degree of common ground was shared with the former; the latter he considered the diametrical opposite of everything the anti-statist represented. The "voluntary Communism" possible under Kropotkin he thought far superior to that championed by Marx and Lassalle; in an economic sense he thought Proudhon eminently right in describing Marxian socialism as "the religion of poverty."[96] So great was his fear of the state as an engine in the hands of a group seeking to bring about nationalization that he refused to concede anything in favor of socialism beyond the intelligence and good intentions of the men advocating it.

In actuality, he looked upon anarchism as a branch of the general socialist movement,[97] and was inclined at one time to less sharply define the antagonistic elements the two opposite wings incorporated. Anarchism, declared Tucker, was "the doctrine that all the affairs of men should be managed by individuals or voluntary associations, and that the State should be abolished"; "Anarchism is for liberty, and neither for nor against anything else." Socialism, on the other hand, was "the belief that the next important step in progress is a change in man's environment of an economic character that shall include the abolition of every privilege whereby the holder of wealth acquires an anti-social power to compel tribute." Thus, the battle of socialism was with "usury," that of anarchism with authority, and the two tended to overlap.[98]

---

[94] *Liberty,* V (September 24, 1887), 1; VII (March 7, 1891), 1, 4. For other aspects of the Haymarket case see Part 6.

[95] *Liberty,* V (May 12, 1888), 4. See also the controversy between Tucker and Most, in which the German paper *Der Sozialist* joined with Most, concerning a German edition of *Liberty,* under the name *Libertas,* and edited by George and Emma Schumm. *Liberty,* V (April 14, 1888), 4; (April 28, 1888), 4.

[96] *Liberty,* I (September 3, 1881), 3.

"State Socialism," however, was an altogether different matter. The emphasis here swung around from strategy to tactics, ending up with the centering of all economic production and exchange in the hands of the state. Thus the movement for socialization became a drive for nationalization by compulsion. Such a conclusion was inevitable if one were to keep in mind the fact that the State, according to the anarchist, was a coercive institution and the very embodiment of the concept of invasion. Hence to utilize the state, or the government of the state, to effect the objectives of socialism was to promote a campaign of physical force as the means whereby it might be done. A system of government-managed monopolies supported by compulsory taxation was a potentiality Tucker contemplated with considerable pain.[99]

Thus Tucker from time to time severely criticized such widely-separated exponents of socialism and nationalization as Edward Bellamy, Laurance Gronlund and Daniel De Leon at times when their names appeared prominently, or when irritated by a serious discussion of their proposals.[100] Generally disturbed by the content of their ideas, he did not incline to indulge in personal diatribes, and his fairness to even implacable opponents was evident. One prominent example was his treatment of Karl Marx. In a full page summary of the latter's importance in the radical movement following his death, Tucker declared that "the cause of labor has lost one of the most faithful friends it ever had," and that every anarchist was bound to "hold his memory in respect." Marx, he declared, however, was the most bitter of all the enemies of anarchism, and the anarchists would henceforth continue to regard him as such, that no one more than he "represented the principle of authority which we live to combat."

---

[97] "Socialism properly includes all plans for the furtherance of human welfare which satisfy the two following conditions: 1. that of acting, not directly upon the nature of individuals, but upon their relations and environment; 2. that of acting upon relations and environment with a view to preventing possession of wealth from being a means of levying on the products of labor. Under this definition, an Anarchist may be a Socialist, and, as a matter of fact, almost all Anarchists are Socialists." *Liberty,* V (January 14, 1888), 4.

[98] *Liberty,* V (March 10, 1888), 2; VI (March 8, 1890), 4.

[99] *Liberty,* II (May 17, 1884), 4; VI (March 8, 1890), 4. Tucker was of the opinion that as bad as things were under monopoly of private nature, under governmental management the services furnished would be poorer in nature and more expensive. *Liberty,* I (January 7, 1882), 2.

[100] *Liberty,* VII (April 19, 1890), 8; (May 24, 1890), 1; (June 28, 1890), 1, 8. Tucker quoted the Boston *Labor Leader* in this latter issue as designating him the "leading exponent voicing reactionary protest against the modern drift toward State Socialism."

Willing to concede his importance as a progenitor of socialism, Tucker refused to accept him as an original thinker, and offered to present specific proof of Proudhon's primacy in a consideration of any portion of *Das Kapital.* Convinced that the labor unions and labor press were exaggerating the importance of Marx as the originator of the economic principles on which all brands of socialism, including the anarchist variety, were based, Tucker insisted that Proudhon be placed in the foremost position by the anti-government group. For their benefit he presented a brief comparison of the two to illustrate why Proudhon deserved their consideration:[101]

> The vital difference between Proudhon and Marx is to be found in the respective remedies which they proposed. Marx would nationalize the productive and distributive forces; Proudhon would individualize and associate them. Marx would make the laborers political masters; Proudhon would abolish political mastership entirely. Marx would abolish usury by having the State lay violent hands on all industry and business and conduct it on the cost principle; Proudhon would abolish usury by disconnecting the State entirely from industry and business and forming a system of free banks which would furnish credit at cost to every industrious and deserving person, and thus place the means of production within the reach of all. Marx believed in compulsory majority rule; Proudhon believed in the voluntary principle.

Although over-simplified, the comparison between anarchism and socialism was typical of the several similar presentations which he made in order to illustrate the fundamental cleavage between the two. This he probably did best of all in his *State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree and Wherein They Differ*, written for public consumption shortly after the Haymarket explosion to vindicate the individualists from imputations of violence or "revolutionary" intentions.[102]

If Tucker's indictment of the various apostles of collectivism was severe, it was no more so than that of the modified individualism of

---

[101] The extended summary of Marx can be found in *Liberty,* II (April 14, 1883), 4. To the perennial Marxist charge that the anarchists were "bourgeois," Tucker replied that such was true to some extent, for "great as is their detestation for a bourgeois society," the anarchists "prefer its partial liberty to the complete slavery of State Socialism." *Twentieth Century,* IV (May 29, 1890), 5.

[102] Tucker claimed to have been paid for this essay by the *North American Review,* but that this journal later refused to print it. For its first appearance in print see *Liberty, V* (March 10, 1888), 2-3, 6.

Henry George and his followers, and no more protracted dispute took place than that between Tucker and his associates and the many articulate Georgists. As with Marx, his concern at first was with the content of the Single Tax theories and Georgist economics, and not with personalities. Tucker conceded George unusual ability, and professed "great esteem" for him as a man, a writer, and a reformer, considered the first two books of *Progress and Poverty* a "stirring indictment of capital" and a "masterly riddling of Malthusian sophistry," but beyond that he disagreed. He admitted George's literary style "singularly lucid and expository," and credited him with having done more "to stimulate economic thought" than any other writer in the English language up to the time of his death.[103]

With large portions of the Georgist doctrine he was in violent disagreement, and these he raked over constantly, especially in the early 80's. Ignoring the basis of most criticisms of George, Tucker spearheaded that of the anarchists, which centered around the fear of land nationalization resulting from the widespread adoption of a uniform land taxation system. Tucker adhered to the argument that land had a legal and not a natural value. Therefore, in short, the course of action was not in supporting a scheme to tax the legal value but in favor of abolishing those laws which established it.[104]

"Anarchism holds that land belongs not to the people but to the occupant and user," he asserted. As long as the occupant refrained from "invading" his neighbors, it was his right to do as he pleased with the land he occupied. The Single Tax advocates, on the other hand, punished by taxation anyone who did not "use his land in accordance with the wishes of his neighbors."[105]

The fundamental argument of the anarchists with the Georgian concept of rent tax collection was its theory of the community; "That there is an entity known as the community which is the rightful owner of all land Anarchists deny. I . . . maintain that "the community" is a nonentity, that it has no existence, and is simply a combination of individuals having no prerogatives beyond those of the individuals themselves. This combination of individuals has no better title to the land than any single individual outside it."[106] Tucker maintained that when exacting "economic rent" the community was merely exercising its "right of the strongest," and that there was no logical reason why it should stop here but not proceed on to complete socialism and the most minute regula-

---

103. *Liberty,* I (November 12, 1881), 2; (June 24, 1882), 3; XIII (December, 1897), 1-2.

104. *Liberty,* V (December 17, 1887), 1.

105. *Liberty,* X (May 19, 1894), 1. Tucker used the term "rent" as a synonym for ground rent, which anarchists considered "an immoral tax." He occasionally applied it to house rent, when monopolistic practices made the building of houses difficult and allowed owners of buildings to continue collecting rent in excess of the original cost of the building.

106. *Liberty,* VI (October 27, 1888), 4-5.

tion of individual conduct: ". . . it is absurd to maintain that, if rent collection by government is proper, then interest collection, wages collection and profit collection are not also logically proper."[107] The major fault of the Georgian plan, according to Tucker, was failure to determine the "just basis of possession" before beginning investigations of economics. It was not the Ricardian concept of varying degrees of fertility of various soils that accounted for rent, but the simple fact of monopoly. Affirming his complete accord with J. K. Ingalls, "who really favors free land," he announced: "I oppose the land-tax scheme because it would not make land free, but would simply make a change of landlords, and because it would enormously increase the power of a worse foe to labor than the landlord,—namely, the State."[108]

On other matters Tucker also disagreed strongly with George, especially on finance, about which he thought the latter knew essentially nothing. He claimed that George had never been able to answer adequately his argument that land was practically useless to labor which was unprovided with capital.[109] Lack of money, he claimed, was far more important in hindering the production of wealth than inaccessibility of "natural opportunities."[110] Tucker, pre-occupied with interest as a term for the payment upon the loan of capital, paid no attention to the Georgian explanation, and differed from him by playing heavily upon the money question while relegating that of land to a subordinate position.[111]

A personal element entered the question after the Haymarket case, when Tucker bitterly condemned George for supporting rather than protesting the conviction of the defendants. He declared that George's *Standard* was the only labor paper to his knowledge which did not pro-

---

107. *Liberty,* I (June 24, 1882), 2-3; VI (January 19, 1889), 5.
108. *Liberty,* V (November 5, 1887), 6.
109. *Liberty,* V (October 24, 1887), 4.
110. " 'To produce wealth in the shape of coal,' says Henry George, 'nothing is needed but a bed of coal and a man.' Yes, one thing else is needed, — a pickaxe. This neglect of the pickaxe and the means of obtaining it is a vital flaw in Mr. George's economy. It leads him to say that what hinders the production of wealth is not the lack of money to pay wages with, but the inability of men who are willing to work to obtain access to natural opportunities. That this lack of access, in the proportion that it exists, is a hindrance to production is undisputable, but in this country it is but a mole-hill in labor's path compared with the mountain that confronts labor in consequence of the lack of money. In fact, the lack of access is largely due to the lack of money." *Liberty,* IV (July 30, 1887), 5.
111. Tucker maintained that laborers were paid out of the product of the labor of men who had previously worked, not out of their own production, and which he said was in the form of "accumulated capital," "monetary titles owned by the employer." For this restatement of the wages fund theory, see *Liberty,* IX (May 20, 1893), 2.

For a recent critique of George's explanation of interest by a prominent student of Georgist economics, see Harry Gunnison Brown, "Henry George and the Causation of Interest," in *Henry George News,* II (October, 1948), 1, 4-5, 8.

test the Illinois Supreme Court decision in the anarchist trial, and suggested that the editor's hope of success in seeking political office had been the deciding factor in motivating him to go along with the court's verdict.[112] For this reason he scouted apologies for George's public behavior offered by supporters who mentioned his private plea that clemency be shown the condemned men. Tucker climaxed a ten year disparagement of George by publishing in 1896, a year before the latter's death, the bitter *Henry George, Traitor,* in which he set forth his objections to the Single Tax leader, for whom he now entertained a violent dislike.[113]

On the behavior of labor unions, Tucker had no hardened convictions. Alternately pleased and dissatisfied with their conduct, he was impressed more with their potentialities than their operation in his time. "Labor unions are a crude step in the direction of supplanting the State," he declared. Although severely critical of their organization, which he thought little different from that of any political organization in their utilization of the "element of force and authority," their movement in the future he felt involved a tendency "for self-government on the part of the people, the logical outcome of which is ultimate revolt against those usurping political conspiracies," which he saw manifested in the judicial and legislative branches of government. He justified strikes, and believed "capital" always the instigator, but saw little chance of success for the strikers except through protracted "consolidated passive resistance." The hope of labor legislation of lasting nature he thought futile, "as long as labor is dependent upon capital, so long will it be outraged with impunity."

Specifically, however, Tucker had nothing encouraging to say to union labor or its program. The Knights of Labor was a target of his abuse for some time prior to Haymarket, and the struggle for the eight hour day was dismissed with a shrug. Speed-up techniques and similar tightening would soon dissipate what little might be gained by the shortening of hours, he thought. His real interest was the hope of observing the development of a union movement not founded "on compulsion, red tape and parliamentary hocus-pocus," and above all, avoiding all compromise with the state. All organization ideally should be predicated upon "spontaneity, free agency and choice," he declared, yet even in their contemporary form, he willingly admitted unions were "a potent sign of emancipation."[114]

---

[112] *Liberty,* V (October 8, 1887), 1; (September 29, 1888), 1; (January 5, 1889), 1. Concerning the possibilities of George as an office holder Tucker commented acidly: "I hope that Henry George will be elected mayor of New York. The laboring men who vote for him will then have a chance to see how little difference it makes to their welfare. . . . There is nothing like a few successes in politics to demonstrate its failure to do more than feather the nests of a few schemers. I cast no reflections upon the character of Henry George, but I distrust the gang at his back. The only difference that I have ever detected between labor politicians and the politicians of the other parties is the usual readiness of the former to sell themselves at a lower price than the latter insist upon." *Liberty,* IV (September 18, 1886), 1.

[113] This was reprinted separately after first appearing in *Liberty,* XII (November, 1896), 2-3. See also the attack on George for his silence in the Haymarket case in *Liberty,* X (November 17, 1894), 1.

On a wide variety of other issues, Tucker was notable for his negative stand. He was implacably opposed to the public school system, and curiously enough, as an atheist, became a defender of Roman Catholic parochial schools[115] as a force which served to produce a "real increase of freedom," to determine the nature of education on a private basis. He looked on woman suffrage with contempt: "It will be a cold day for Liberty when woman takes the reins of power," he commented disparagingly on observing the militancy of the movement. Another of his antipathies was compulsory taxation for community services such as street repairs, water works, sewerage facilities and fire and police departments, regardless of the size of the community. He believed such needs could be provided for on the basis of voluntary contribution, and with a smaller percentage of non-contributors than of delinquency of tax-paying in the cities of the United States.[116]

One of Tucker's most aggravating stands was an outgrowth of his all-out struggle with the concept of authority. He stood fast by the assertion that children were "labor products" of the mother, not creatures with a separate and unique catalogue of rights. Since he did not believe in the institution of marriage, and since he could not, as an anarchist, place the responsibility of the child upon "society," this was his only remaining logical alternative. Eschewing sentimentality and explaining this choice in terms of a "labor product" alienated several associates at a later time, among them J. William Lloyd.[117]

The religious radicals and freethought exponents of the Boston Liberal League, Thaddeus B. Wakeman, Horace Seaver, J. P. Mendum and his earlier opponent Francis Abbot were constant targets for his barbs, especially for their tendency to overwork the word "liberal," which, remarked Tucker, was "a vague and much abused term."[118] Their struggle against the church was really part of *Liberty's* campaign against the concept of authority, prodded Tucker, and to be really consistent, they should ally themselves with the anarchists. He was equally displeased with several other portions of the reform front. Fundamental change, not reform, was Tucker's real interest. To adhere to the latter course, he said, was to abandon the "plumb line" for the "cork-screw."

---

[114] For Tucker's theoretical estimates of the labor movement see *Liberty,* I (February 4, 1882), 3; (April 1, 1882), 2; (June 10, 1882), 2-3; VII (May 24, 1890), 1. For his estimate of the unions of his time see Part 6.

[115] *Liberty,* III (January 9, 1886), 4. Tucker's opposition to compulsory public school education was of long standing. His objection was based primarily on the belief that majority opinion would determine the nature and content of, and the approach to, the materials taught. *The Word,* I (February, 1873), *The Index,* IV (November 6, 1873), 433.

[116] *Liberty,* II (October 14, 1882), 1. Tucker once quoted from an address by President Warren of Boston University, which had praised the voluntary system as it had operated in the cities in the German Hanseatic League.

[117] See J. William Lloyd, "Memories of Benjamin R. Tucker," in Ishill (ed.), *Free Vistas,* II, 282.

---

118. *Liberty,* I (February 4, 1882), 2.

CHAPTER IX

Benjamin R. Tucker and the Age of Liberty II

4. *Victor S. Yarros Delineates the Spencerian Influence*

The writings of Herbert Spencer began to acquire the pliability of the scriptures during the last two decades of nineteenth century United States, in that their scope afforded the opportunity for diverse elements to dip in, extract, and manipulate, for various purposes, portions which might buttress some particular stand. For instance, the exponents of laissez-faire found therein the sanction for the maintenance of the economic and social status-quo. At the same time they found comfort and support for even greater expansion of monopoly enterprise in their Darwinistic content, which seemed to justify all this as part of a program of cosmic evolution of civilization.

The American anarchists, on the other hand, hardly the friends of monopoly interests, appropriated those arguments of Spencer which appeared to substantiate their attack upon the state, the earlier output of the English sociologist furnishing especially welcome ammunition. Spencer's name acquired status among the anarchists for other reasons than as a champion of freedom and attacker of government. The ethical concept of equal rights and the evolutionary approach to societal growth were both incorporated within the structure of anarchist propaganda as corollaries to the Warrenite individual sovereignty principle and the anarchist concept of cultural change. No blanket acceptance of Spencer was implied by favorable mention when they found his ideas compatible; some of his views indeed received stringent treatment at their hands. Only a portion of the anarchist ranks accepted him in any capacity, and a swinging away from him as a potential prophet took place eventually when the man and his work began to be studied as a whole.

Of a number who spread Spencerian doctrines among the group of anti-statist intellectuals and evaluated Spencer's contributions to the ethical and sociological side of anarchism, Victor S. Yarros was undoubtedly the most prominent. Like Tucker, Yarros had a background of participation in radical activities. A native of the Ukraine, he had left home and come to the United States to escape arrest as one of the Social Revolutionaries.[1] His first associations in America were naturally with the communist anarchists, whose objective, "socialism without a state," he firmly supported, and to whose publications he first contributed while hardly twenty years of age.[2]

---

[1] Yarros, *Adventures in the Realm of Ideas,* 5; same author, "Benjamin R. Tucker et l'Anarchisme Philosophique," in *L'Unique,* VIII (May, 1947), 153-154.

While a resident of New Haven, Connecticut, during the mid-eighties, his association with a group of workers who sponsored speakers of various persuasions brought him into contact with the individualists of the anarchist camp, with state socialists and with Marxians. Here also he made his first contacts with Spencer's thought through lecture appearances of William Graham Sumner[3] of the Yale University faculty. Late in 1885 Yarros began to write for *Liberty,* and his long association with Tucker, which at times practically amounted to a partnership, now began.[4] Of all the writers whose work appeared in this paper, none exceeded the former in influence; indeed at times *Liberty* hardly amounted to more than a two-man journal.

Yarros derived intellectual stimulation from a variety of sources; the anarchist dissertations of such speakers as Henry Appleton and Dyer D. Lum; the writings of Tucker, John F. Kelly and John William Lloyd; and the individualism of Max Stirner through such American exponents of the philosophy as James L. Walker and John Beverley Robinson.[5] He contributed a number of reports to *Liberty* along with polemics aimed at Johann Most and the socialists Edward Aveling and Liebknecht, following the American tour of the latter two in 1886.[6] Early in the next year Yarros began his career as an original contributor to the anarchist journal, and regularly supplied work of considerable quality thereafter.

Yarros' main concern centered around the adaptation to the anarchist philosophy of such support as could be gleaned from Darwin and Spencer and the general idea of social evolution. Thus, solution of social problems and antistatism, and the rejection of socialism, political action and legislation, as appeared in the writings of Yarros, were founded on studies of Spencer to a great extent.[7] A third element, the subscription to the equal rights doctrine as taught by Spencer, found Yarros in agreement after a period of attachment to the opposite approach of Stirner and the concept of the existence of rights as a result of voluntary contract alone. Yarros did reject Spencer's organismal theory of the nature of society, and eventually gave up most of his sociology as well, evincing more concern over the latter's political ideas and anti-statist leanings as expressed in portions of the original edition of *Social Statics*.

---

[2] See his article "The Russian Movement," in *Truth,* I (June, 1884), 37-39.

[3] Yarros at first thought Sumner an exponent of anarchism because of his championing of free trade and general opposition to government. There is no indication at first of any realization that Sumner was cited by the supporters of the system as well as the left-wing critics, or that he was a wholehearted supporter of interest taking. Within a year, however, he was calling Sumner and other supporters "the bourgeoisie's loyal servants." *Liberty,* III (March 27, 1886), 8; IV (February 12, 1887), 4.

[4] See Yarros' contributions in *Liberty,* III (October 24, 1885), 1; November 14, 1885), 1; (December 26, 1885), 1; IV (January 1, 1887), 5; (July 3, 1886), 4-5; V (August 13, 1887), 7. It was in the latter issue that he testified, "There is no danger of my finding Anarchism ridiculous and abandoning it," which stands in strange contrast to his much later remark, "Of all the possible and impossible utopias, that of the philosophical anarchists is, of course, the most preposterous one. How many persons in the world today can even *imagine* a society without a State?" Yarros, "The Persistence of Utopian Thinking," in *The Social Frontier,* V (June, 1939), 266. Stress is Yarros'.

[5] *Liberty,* IV (April 17, 1886), 8; V (September 10, 1887), 5; (October 8, 1887), 6.

Whatever he may have declared at a later time, Yarros was convinced, while associated with Tucker and *Liberty*, that anarchism was not a variety of utopianism. He disagreed entirely with sociological interpretations of anarchism as the logical conclusion of democracy, or the "perfection" of the latter. This view, he observed, resulted in using anarchism as "a synonym for a millennial condition," and had no relation to the anarchism toward which he and the Tucker group worked, which was "the reign of simple justice and equity,"[8] a logical outcome of the "law of true society," equal liberty. Explained Yarros:[9]

> The anarchists, as anarchists, work directly, not for a perfect social state, but for a perfect political system. A perfect social state is a state totally free from sin or crime or folly; a perfect political system is merely a system in which justice is observed, in which nothing is punished but crime and nobody coerced but invaders.

Every variety of collectivist solution fell under Yarros' particular criticism during the period of his greatest activity as a contributor to *Liberty*. "Freedom in sociological experiment" was the important concept which planners of "uniform regulation" failed to comprehend, and was the principal road to any type of healthy social organization; "Anarchism will supersede authoritarian views of life in the same way that dogmas of special creation have been superseded by the doctrine of evolution."[10] Thus Marxist[11] and Bellamyite socialists drew a large measure of calculated abuse from the new champion of individual freedom lately drawn from the collectivist camp. He rebuked the latter for saying that anarchists desired a state of "no law" by demanding that they examine more carefully the true contention, the opposition to gov-

---

6. Yarros, "Socialist Quackery," in *Liberty,* IV (December 11, 1886), 4-5. For Yarros as associate editor of *Liberty* from 1890 to 1892, see *Liberty,* VII (June 7, 1890), 4; VIII (April 30, 1892), 1.
7. See for instance Yarros, "Government and Social Evolution," in *Liberty,* VII (November 29, 1890), 4-5.
8. See Yarros' dispute over definitions with D. G. Thompson, a Spencerian sociologist, in *Liberty,* VIII (April 30, 1892), 2.
9. *Liberty,* VII (January 2, 1892), 2.
10. *Liberty,* VI (August 10, 1889), 5.
11. Yarros was inconsistent on Marx, having admitted being "an admiring student of Marx and sympathetic subscriber to his philosophical views of societary development." *Liberty,* VI (February 23, 1889), 5.

ernment as a synonym for a "compulsory protection." "Protection and taxation without consent is itself invasion; anarchism favors a system of voluntary taxation and protection." Bellamy's ideal of a planned society received a severe assault, and Yarros dismissed *Looking Backward* as a "ridiculously over-rated" production.[12]

The great need was freedom, not system-building, said Yarros; once this had been realized, then the course of action was to let human institutions develop the way they would. This remained part of his philosophy of society even after he had definitely given up hope in the program of the individualist anarchist group, at the conclusion of the first World War. Even then he persisted in attempting to convince socialist critics of capitalism that privilege and monopoly were not the results of freedom and competition, that these concepts were not related, and that it was misleading to describe them in cause-effect relationships.[13]

To one Marxian concept in particular he had a fundamental objection: the "historical necessity" theory of the revolutionary character of the industrial worker. Agreeing that changes in social organization would or could be effected by a minority, his lack of faith in the soundness of Marxian revolutionary propositions was pronounced. Increasingly oppressive conditions bred as much callousness, stupidity and "savage selfishness" as revolt or criticism, while he noticed in his own time, in the summer of 1890, a noticeable lack among the working class both of "inflammable material" and "skilled conspirators." It was not a matter of doubting the good faith of the socialist in desiring to impose a new order which would guarantee the freedom of the individual. Adhering to the conviction of the anarchists that the utility of any kind of progressive measure first had to be demonstrated rather than forced upon people, it was in reality the necessity of establishing freedom first, in order to allow the growth of a new economic order. Nor was it a question of abstract right or wrong which both minorities and majorities injected into the contest for political power. The same principle operated whether the majority tyrannized the minority or society crushed the individual. Both were engaged in a contest, attempting to enforce their own concept of "right." It was Yarros' belief that the anarchists raised a third issue in the struggle between "government and freedom," the gradual elimination of government from the "spheres" of social life.[14] In two extended series of articles[15] under the general headings of "Individualism and Political Economy" and "Unscientific Socialism" he presented his most able critique of the several "schools of state socialism," and a restatement of anarchist faith in evolution toward a stateless order: liberty both as means and end of all reform, and rejection of violence and revolution.

---

[12] *Liberty,* VI (June 29, 1889), 7-8.

[13] Yarros, *Our Revolution; Essays in Interpretation,* 80, 177.

[14] *Liberty,* VII (August 16, 1890), 2-3.

[15] This ran through seven numbers of *Liberty* between May and October, 1890.

Yarros interpreted the phenomenon of vice as the result rather than the cause of poverty and ignorance, and laid the blame for the existence of poverty to "the monopoly of land, money and trade." It was his conviction that the "defenders" of rent and interest-taking had yet to show that such was just, as well as to disprove the contention of the radicals that profits would gradually be done away with through the operation of free competition. In fact, it was the attempt to meet the economic arguments of the anarchists and socialists which was driving political economists into supporting state regulation. Yet he had little respect for economists, whom he described as "a mutual admiration society," singularly successful in "maintaining a characteristic vagueness about their creeds."[16] In this respect he shared Tucker's suspicion of the academic mind, which he displayed in his disparagement of such exponents of the new sociology as Lester Ward and Albion W. Small. The former's prestige he thought primarily due to log-rolling on the part of fellow academic sociologists, although appreciating his estimate of the state as the bulwark of laissez-faire vested interests.[17]

There was no doubt in Yarros' mind, from an examination of his writing in *Liberty*, that Spencer had made the most important contributions to the philosophy of freedom of the individual from the state. At one time in 1889 he proclaimed, "More than to any sociological author are the anarchists indebted to Herbert Spencer for the scientific and philosophical argumentation which supports their position." No secret was made of the fact that Spencer was the source of most of his theorizing: "Nobody has better stated and elucidated the real relations of social organizations to individual organisms," he acknowledged on still another occasion.[18] It is no wonder that he found it disquieting to be forced to make repeated admissions of Spencerian aberrations after such glowing dedications.

---

16. *Liberty,* VII (August 16, 1890), 4-5; VIII (August 20, 1892); X (January 26, 1895), 3.
17. Yarros, "Sociocracy and Government," in *Liberty,* XIII (March, 1899), 2-3; Ward, *The Psychic Factors in Civilization* (Boston, 1893), 285. Ward's "sociocracy" was to Yarros a vague and unsatisfying compromise between anarchist and socialist tendencies as a form of government. As defined by Ward, it meant society acting "through an agency chosen by its members," which Yarros said was undistinguishable from political democracy, in that decisions would ultimately have to be made by agents of the majority. The latter was inclined to believe that in operation it would resemble more a type of Comtean priesthood who knew best what was for society's good. For an estimate of Ward as the most prominent of the Comteans among American sociologists, and suggesting Marxian interpretations of Comte and others for gleanings which might be used to substantiate the "institutional" approach of the class struggle, see Bernhard J. Stern, "A Note on Comte," in *Science and Society,* I (Fall, 1936), 114-119.
18. *Liberty,* IV (July 20, 1889), 4; VII (February 21, 1891), 6.

The rejection of Sumner had already begun. Yarros no longer spoke of him with respect but as a "half-hearted friend of liberty" who dodged fundamental issues, resulting in the increased belief by reformers that the remedy lay in state regulation and intervention. His remarks on anarchism Yarros now considered trite and false, showing unacquaintance with radical literature of this group. In actuality, Yarros now proclaimed, Sumner was a "middle class philosopher," not interested in fighting the monopolies and encroachments perpetuated by a minority under the protection of the state.[19]

The rejection of Spencer came in the spring of 1890, and grew out of his reading of the former's *Absolute Political Ethics,* in which much of what he had declared in *Man Versus the State* was disregarded.[20] Particularly damaging to the anarchists was the Spencerian support of majority coercion of non-aggressive minorities within a nation on the basis that there existed a scientific warrant for such procedure.[21] Yarros repudiated this completely, as well as the tacit approval of land monopoly, one of Spencer's most vehement condemnations at an earlier time.

Yarros now began to recommend the reading of Spencer by anarchists in order that they might be able to discover for themselves the difference between Spencerian individualism and the basic philosophy of individualist anarchism. Associated with this was the growth of various Liberty and Property Defense Leagues, "striving to maintain their privileges and monopolies," said Yarros, which adopted Spencer as their intellectual guide-post.[22] These were evidence enough to the anti-statist people that there was now a wide gulf between the two groups who found in the writings of Spencer support for differing social outlooks. Specifically objectionable were the singling out of factory acts and poor laws for assault while ignoring the sins of omission of the legislative process. Another objection was the attack on the trade union movement due to its growing aggressiveness, which Yarros defended:[23]

---

[19] *Liberty,* IV (February 12, 1887), 4; VI; (July 20, 1889), 4.

[20] See the critical articles in *Liberty,* VI (March 8, 1890), 4-5; VIII (August 8, 1891), 2.

It is interesting to note the fluctuation in Yarros' estimations of Spencer during 1889-1892. Chronological comparison indicates no definite stand during the earlier part of this period, but a decidedly critical trend starts in the latter part of 1891.

[21] Yarros, "Spencerian Government and Anarchism," in *Liberty,* VII (July 26, 1890), 5-6; same author, "Justice and Anarchism," in *Liberty,* VIII (August 29, 1891), 2-3; (September 5, 1891), 2-3; (September 19, 1891), 2; (September 26, 1891), 3.

[22] Yarros, "Are We Fit For Freedom?" in *Liberty,* IX (April 7, 1894), 2.

[23] *Liberty,* IX (April 7, 1894), 2. For other articles by Yarros critical of Spencer for singling out factory and poor legislation for condemnation, and for attacking anarchism following the execution of Vaillant in France for throwing a bomb in the Chamber of Deputies, see "Spencer's Injustice to Anarchism," in *Liberty,* IX (February 24, 1894), 3-4, and "Individualist Impotence," in *Liberty,* X (October 6, 1894), 2.

> Having to fight organized, State-supported monopolies, finding themserves reduced to the necessity of accepting inequitable terms through prior violations of equal freedom on the part of the governing power, they cannot always exercise sufficient self-restraint to keep within the bounds of legitimate resistance. Instead of indulging in futile denunciations, we ought to labor to remove the factors which render legitimate resistance on the part of trades unions more and more ineffectual and unsuccessful.

Unlike Yarros, Tucker had little interest in the sociology of others, and remained content to allow the former to take the initiative in such speculations. It is probable that the only one of Spencer's works which really pleased Tucker was the chapter from *Social Statics* titled "The Right To Ignore the State," which he considered "unanswerable."[24] On the unfavorable side, he had begun to criticize the intent of Spencer's attacks on socialism as early as 1884, nearly a year and a half before Yarros first became known in *Liberty*. The occasion was the publication by Spencer in the *Popular Science Monthly* and the *Contemporary Review* of "The Coming Slavery" and similar essays, the good faith of which was seriously doubted. Commented Tucker:[25]

> He is making a wholesale onslaught on Socialism as the incarnation of the doctrine of State omnipotence carried to its highest power. And I am not sure he is quite honest in this. I begin to be a little suspicious of him. It seems as if he had forgotten the teachings of his earlier writings, and had become a champion of the capitalistic class . . . amid his multitudinous illustrations . . . of the evils of legislation, he in every instance cites some law passed ostensibly at least to protect labor, alleviating suffering, or promote the people's welfare. But never once does he call attention to the far more deadly and deep-seated evils growing out of the innumerable laws creating privilege and sustaining monopoly.

Thus Tucker occupied himself attempting to differentiate between the passive state advocated by Spencer's conservative followers from the voluntary defensive alliance which the anarchists designated as the limit of government. He disclaimed association with the group who sought to confine the functions of the state to the protection of "life" and "property." The latter word Tucker particularly disliked, believing it to be a mere euphemism for previously acquired monopolies and advantages when used by conservatives. Anarchists, far from wishing any part of such a situation, sought instead the dissolution of the state into its component individualities, and a subsequent regrouping into any pattern the people might desire, without infringement on the basic principle of individual liberty. This, said Tucker, hardly was synonymous with the Spencerian viewpoint.[26]

---

[24] When the 1892 revised edition of *Social Statics* appeared but missing this chapter, Tucker became incensed and reprinted it as a separate pamphlet, announcing in a preface that it had been repudiated by Spencer.

[25] *Liberty*, II (May 17, 1884), 4. It is thus obvious that Tucker had become suspicious of Spencerian anti-statism even before Yarros had begun his extensive study of the relationship between Spencer and anarchism. Although both Greene and Heywood had been extremely critical of Spencer, Tucker paid little attention to him as either a sociologist or political scientist until a breach had developed between himself and Yarros over the merits of Max Stirner.

The growing conviction that Spencer was no longer worthy of being regarded as an influential intellectual support was confirmed by his repudiation in 1892 of both his former anti-state writing and Proudhon,[27] who had by now acquired the status of a giant in the field of anarchist literature. Henceforth Tucker included Spencer among those exposed to his barbs, which number gradually included articulate Spencerians[28] of several types. Some while later, Tucker's more considered judgment of him was somewhat kinder: "Anarchists recognize in Herbert Spencer a kindred spirit, and offer to his memory their tribute of admiration and gratitude," even though they could not, he said, "accept him as a trustworthy exponent of their political philosophy."[29] In the meantime, *Liberty* had become a radical journal of international repute, with contributors from every section of the United States as well as from most of the countries of western Europe. In addition, a philosophical crisis has been precipitated as a result of the influence of the revived interest in Max Stirner, from whom the individualists derived the principles of an altogether different basis of social conduct. A study of the many personalities attracted to Tucker's paper during its nearly 30 years of existence, and the issues they found necessary to dissect during the time, is one of the neglected episodes of American radical history at the close of the century.

5. *Stirnerism and the Tucker Associates*

One of the popular designations which the individualist anarchist group acquired during the 80's was the identification "Boston Anarchists," although any other term could hardly have been less exact.[30] Less than a quarter of the prominent contributors to *Liberty* during its entire history were even from New England, let alone residents of the Massachusetts city. The East and Midwest were well-represented, and writings of residents of Florida, Texas, California and Oregon found their way before the audience of sympathizers to anarchist philosophy. Missouri, Kansas and Iowa developed centers of anarchist literature of their own which had surprising circulation. However, their story is a part of the influence of *Liberty* and the inspirational stimulus of Tucker. In the main, the important contributors to *Liberty* became associated primarily during the first ten years, even though there were a few notable adherents thereafter. The majority of these came at three different occasions, 1883-1884, 1886-1887, and 1891-1892, and did not represent any degree of like-mindedness. In fact, the reason for the appearance of so much articulate radical talent was not an effort to establish a common front against conservatism but more the result of serious doctrinal disputes among themselves. The latter two dates especially were incidents of notable bitterness, and were accompanied by defections of prominent former collaborators from the Tuckerite wing. A survey of the gradual acquisition of *Liberty's* impressive literate talent makes the development of the split somewhat more comprehensible.

---

[26] *Liberty,* IV (July 30, 1887), 4. Tucker was affronted by being mistaken for an exponent of Spencerian individualism by Henry Demarest Lloyd, who invited him to speak on the subject at the World's Congress Auxiliary of the Columbian Exposition. He summarily refused the invitation. *Liberty,* IX (February 25, 1893), 2.

[27] In an interview with one of Tucker's friends, Frederick R. Burton, Spencer admitted never having read Proudhon, having nothing but contempt for him. He did admit being repulsed by the Proudhonian remark "property is robbery," without knowing what it really meant. Tucker, in reporting the interview, mentioned being extremely piqued at finding Spencer refer to Proudhon as a "communist" in *Social Statics. Liberty,* VIII (June 25, 1892), 1.

[28] See for instance Tucker's acid report on an article by the social Darwinist Henry D. Chapin, "The Survival of the Unfit," in *The Popular Science Monthly,* XLI (June, 1892), 182-187, in *Liberty,* VIII (June 25, 1892), 1.

[29] *Liberty,* XIV (January, 1904), 1. See also the repudiation by Yarros, "Spencer and Political Science," in *Liberty,* XIV (February, 1904), 2.

Liberty during its first three years was primarily the personal organ of Tucker. Such pioneers as Ingalls and Spooner were among the contributors, as well as Sidney H. Morse, the old friend of Warren and staunch supporter of the labor exchange.[31] Even Ezra Heywood and

---

[30] The later term "philosophical anarchism" drew the following response from Tucker, "It is my impression that the use of the adjective "philosophic" as descriptive of our movement originated outside. I have never accepted it, and rarely, if ever, have I used it. Every fool thinks himself a philosopher." *Liberty,* XII (July 11, 1896, 4.

[31] During the first few years, several of the contributors to *Liberty* wrote under pseudonyms, or signed their articles with single letters. Spooner wrote under "O," Morse, "H." See the series of seven articles by Morse in *Liberty* titled "Liberty and Wealth," which paraphrased the career of Warren and sought to explain the operation of the early equitable commerce, which Tucker published from May to October, 1884. Spooner was particularly active at the time of Haymarket, showing special interest in the conduct of the trial, a natural expectation in view of his long career in law. He was outspoken in condemning the court as more criminal than the men, and denouncing Captain Michael Schaack of the Chicago police, for "rigging" the evidence in such a manner that the defendants were unable to find an opportunity to meet it when the trial began. Tucker was extremely fond of Spooner's *Letter to Grover Cleveland,* but disagreed with the latter's defense of property in ideas. *Liberty,* IV (September 18, 1886), 4-5; (November 20, 1886), 1, 7; VII (March 21, 1891), 4; *Boston Herald,* August 22, 1886.

Tucker agreed with Ingalls as to the basis of land tenure, but engaged in numerous debates on the matter of currency. Heywood and Andrews were more objects of criticism, although Heywood's trial in 1883 was followed with considerable interest. *Liberty,* I (June 24, 1882), 3; III (December 13, 1884), 4-5; III (January 3, 1885), 4-5; (October 3, 1885), 4; VII

Andrews, no longer "plumb-liners" and interested in reforms of their own, drew some space, although mostly on the derogatory side. It could be seen quite plainly, however, that the rise of Tucker to prominence as the chief among the intellectual anarchist pamphleteers was the signal for the parallel rise of a new generation of adherents to the cause. The majority of the writers of this group were journalists, as was Tucker himself. Trained to write, and generally prevented by the nature or circumstances of their employment from expressing their anti-state convictions and beliefs, they brought to Tucker's paper a quality of radical writing unsurpassed in its own time, and rarely approached since. Of the early number besides Yarros the most prominent were Joseph A. Labadie, Alan and John F. Kelly, Henry Appleton, Edwin C. Walker, Florence Finch,[32] J. H. Swain,[33] M. E. Lazarus and James L. Walker. The years 1885-1886 saw new entrants, notably John William Lloyd, Gertrude B. Kelly, Dyer D. Lum and Alfred B. Westrup. It was this group of enthusiasts, several of whom wrote under pseudonyms, that produced the controversial material which made *Liberty* an absorbing paper even to conservative readers. It was also among these that the strains developed resulting in the first split in the individualist front in 1887. A brief account of the diversity of their backgrounds and contributions illustrates this point.

Alan Kelly, also a Boston newspaperman, became Tucker's first editorial associate, remaining in that capacity until May, 1888. A bitter critic of the railroads, most of his better articles were aimed at railroad monopolies which threatened to become the "American monarchy" and which had already "disinherited the people from an area of land 33 times the size of New Hampshire."[34]

Labadie followed the first of the three Kellys to write for *Liberty*. A Detroit printer and writer for a number of socialist and labor papers,

---

(August 30, 1890), 5. For the trial see the running comment in issues from November 25, 1882 through April 12, 1883.

[32] A follower of Appleton and later the wife of Alan Kelly, she wrote on the relation between the anarchists and the labor unions, and became a socialist in 1892. *Liberty,* III (June 19, 1884), 4; III (November 8, 1884), 4; VIII (May 21, 1892), 1. One of the earliest residents of Hull House, Florence Kelly's investigation of sweated labor in Chicago led to the passage of the first factory law in Illinois. She became the first factory inspector through appointment by Governor Altgeld. Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull House* (New York, 1910), 201, 207, 310. For her sympathetic account of Tucker and her association with the anarchists see Florence Finch Kelly, *Flowing Stream* (New York, 1939), 190-196.

[33] Swain, a California labor organizer, became acquainted wtih Tucker through the socialist movement, and left this group to become an anarchist. He, Tucker and August Spies conducted a three-way correspondence in *Liberty* after the national Socialist Congress in Chicago of October, 1881. See also the short biographical sketch by Tucker in *Liberty* following Swain's death in June, 1892. VIII (June 25, 1892), 1.

[34] For a sample of Kelly's style see the articles, written under the pseudonyms "K" and "Max," in *Liberty,* III (May 17, 1884), 5; (June 14, 1884), 5; (September 6, 1884), 4; (October 4, 1884), 4; (February 28, 1885), 5.

including Haskell's *Truth,* and the Detroit papers *Today* and the *Advance and Labor Leaf,*[35] among others, his relations with other portions of the radical and reform movement remained partially intact during his participation in Tucker's literary experiment. A contributor as early as June, 1883, he still remained as secretary of the national board of supervision of the Socialist Labor Party a year later. During this period he gradually lost faith in reconciliation between the various fragments of the socialist movement but retained a strong interest in the fortunes of the labor movement.[36] In this however he gradually became the exponent of anarchist measures, and argued the anti-statist case with their leaders and before their conventions when he attended.[37]

Most of Labadie's ideas in *Liberty* were presented through the medium of a column, "Cranky Notions."[38] In agreement with Tucker on most points, he still clung to the belief that the labor movement could produce benefits, primarily in obtaining reductions in the hours worked, with neither raises nor reductions in pay. Admitting his loss of faith in socialism during the fall of 1888, he still considered it expedient for the government to control "natural monopolies" such as water works, streets and railroads; but he thought that schools, banks, post offices, and like institutions should best be left to operation by individuals. Like Tucker, he backed the assertion that the best way to prevent monopolies would be to withhold the grant of franchises.[39]

Politically, Labadie inclined to a policy of compromise also, in the hope of extracting some gain from a situation which was bound to remain deadlocked as the result of insistence upon total realization of ideals. Unimpressed with voting as utilized under universal suffrage, which he described as "a process by which truth is established by numbers," he considered that anarchists might use it to advance the "principles of liberty." "All political questions mean either more or less government," said Labadie, in defending the participation of anarchists in voting in order to forestall more positive legislation. Nationally, he was shocked by the Republican program, which he said was that of "establishing a nation with a big N and crushing out local autonomies." Under their sponsorship he saw the realization of Hamiltonian authoritarianism in its greatest severity, and for this reason inclined to favor the Democrats, whom he saw as still opposed to the centralizing of power. Throughout his gradual swing to anarchism, Labadie retained friendly relations with the Knights of Labor and other workingmen's organizations. It was his belief that his persistence was responsible for weakening the faith of some of Detroit's most active and intelligent labor leaders in the principle of government control. It was not necessary to "desert one's area of agitation" on becoming an anarchist, Labadie held, and under this impression remained one of Tucker's closest associates, a relationship which even the end of *Liberty* did not terminate.[40]

---

[35] Labadie became editor of the *Advance* from July to December, 1887. *Liberty,* IV (July 30, 1887), 1; V (December 3, 1887), 1.

[36] *Liberty,* II (June 9, 1883), 3; III (December 13, 1884), 1; *Truth,* I, new series, (June, 1884), iii; (July, 1884), 141; (October 15, 1884), 347.

[37] Labadie delivered an address arguing the anarchist point of view at the general assembly of the Knights of Labor in Minneapolis in the fall of 1887, and the next year suggested a convention of anarchists in Detroit for the purpose of issuing a manifesto to the world in the hope of preventing the growth of misconceptions as to their intentions. *Liberty,* V (November 5, 1887), 5; (February 25, 1888), 5; VI (December 15, 1888), 1. He believed the "press and pulpit" guilty of laying the blame for the numerous outrages upon them without proof.

[38] "Cranky Notions" began appearing in *Liberty* with the January 14, 1888 issue.

[39] *Liberty,* III (January 3, 1885), 8; V (February 25, 1888), 5; (March 31, 1888), 1, 7; (June 26, 1888), 5; VI (October 13, 1888), 7. Tucker agreed with Labadie on some of his proposals, considering the stand on government operation of the railroads sound. He disapproved of remaining in contact with the Knights, however, probably because of personal dislike for Terence V. Powderly.

From the point of view of intellect, the outstanding member of the first group of *Liberty* writers was Henry Appleton. A graduate of Brown University and a Providence, R. I. newspaperman, he had become acquainted with anarchism of the native brand at about the same time as Tucker.[41] Appleton developed a reputation for brilliance both as a writer and speaker within the radical movement, contributing to Heywood's *Word,* the *Index* and the *Irish World* besides the Tucker journal, under pseudonyms in both the latter.[42]

Anarchism as expounded in *Liberty,* said Appleton, was the philosophical basis of a method in sociology, and fully as deserving of consideration as any other. In another sense, it was not a "mere theory," but the direct and logical outcome "of the progressive movement to simplify and popularize government." Neither was it an institution, but in actuality the "sworn enemy" of all institutions, with a mission to disintegrate them "whenever found." Since liberty was the "life principle" of anarchism, and every institution denied liberty, then anarchism and institutions were opposites by nature. Only in liberty was it possible for the anarchist to find order, and from this state of liberty stemmed consent, "the pivotal basis of all arrangements worthy of the name government."[43]

---

[40] *Liberty,* VI (November 10, 1888), 1. Labadie did not distinguish the varieties of anarchists as Tucker thought was necessary. "It is immaterial whether one be a Communist or an Individualist so long as he be an Anarchist. Anarchy, as I see it, admits of any kind of organization, so long as membership is not compulsory." *Liberty,* V (April 4, 1888), 8. For Labadie's adherence to Tucker in the controversy over Stirner, see *Liberty,* V (June 26, 1888), 5.

[41] *Liberty,* II (June 28, 1884), 5; III (February 28, 1885), 4; (November 28, 1885), 5. Appleton wrote for some time under the pseudonym "X."

[42] *Liberty,* III (December 12, 1885), 4; *The Word,* IV (January, 1876), 3; *The Index,* VII, 344-345. Appleton argued that the free-thought and anarchist movements had a common purpose, and that it was the work of both church and government to teach men to live without the need of either, not the inculcation of dependence upon both as paternalistic institutions.

Appleton did not agree with Tucker unreservedly. The two matched arguments and opinions many times before the final break took place in 1887. The very definition of the word "anarchy" was a matter of contention between them. Appleton held that the word meant opposition to the *archos,* or political leader, while Tucker averred that it had a much broader connotation. Opposition to the *archē,* variously interpreted as "beginning" and "origin," and which extended to cover "first principle," "supreme power" and "governmental office," this, said Tucker, was the correct definition of "anarchy" with relation to its Greek root.[44]

In his approach to both the state and the church Appleton differed from Tucker also. He held that the separation of the two had never taken place, and that such "devices" as authority, majority rule, and popular suffrage made the maintenance of the church a vital part of the maintenance of the state. Nor did he find the state as a political structure the reason for as much evil as Tucker; the fault lay in individuals who had no desire to exercise freedom:[45]

> As an Individualist, I find the political State a consequent rather than an antecedent. . . . The State is a variable quantity—expanding just in proportion as previous surrenders of individual sovereignty give it material. The initial cause is, however, the surrendering individual, the State being possible only after the surrender. Hence the individual is the proper objective point of reform. As he is reformed, the State disappears of itself.

The condition which facilitated the default on the part of the individual of his precious sovereignty, Appleton went on, was not arbitrary tyranny, but "that diseased condition known as centralization." The breaking up of the large cities and the localization of the population upon the land in smaller communities would destroy the state, but hope of such action on the part of the urban individual was futile. Labor meetings resounded with the cry "the land belongs to the people," he observed, but not even whipping would drive people from the cities to enjoy what they allegedly wanted. Hence his stress upon individual conversion, which Tucker dismissed as a worthy endeavor. In line with such sentiments of Appleton's was his detestation for the expression "the masses," "a term having no scientific value and utterly meaningless in sociology." Reform could come only through the actions of individuals. From this aversion for "dragging along the masses in bulk" came his blow at labor organization along political lines for the purposes of supplying a counter-force to that of monopoly capital. It was not the laboring man's fault, for he had been taught that force was a valid moral principle; however, the recourse to force to solve all crises would surely accelerate "social chaos." "I say to Labor, Organize! . . . but with your backs towards the ballot boxes, for all seeming emancipation through politics is illusory and costs far more than it is worth."[46]

---

[43] *Liberty,* III (November 14, 1885), 7; (November 28, 1885), 4; (March 6, 1886), 4.

[44] *Liberty,* IV (February 26, 1887), 5.

[45] *Liberty,* IV (February 26, 1887), 4. For Appleton's survey of the relation between church and state, see *Liberty,* II (June 14, 1884), 4.

Not all of those attracted by Tucker's paper were urban radicals under the influence of conditions produced by industrial living. Three of the most articulate were agrarians, Lloyd, Lazarus and E. C. Walker, and their ideas of social organization were closest to those long proclaimed by Warren. Lloyd, although a native of New Jersey, wrote from Grahamville, Florida when first connected with *Liberty,* while Lazarus, a veteran of thirty years' pamphleteering in radical economic causes, operated a small farm in Guntersville, in upcountry Alabama. Walker's first association with the radical movement was an outgrowth of his relation through marriage to Moses Harman, the publisher of a vigorous woman's rights press in Valley Falls, Kansas. His paper, *Lucifer, the Light Bearer,*[47] grew to be somewhat anarchist in its viewpoint as Walker assumed a larger part in its publication, and much material of importance to the individualist propaganda first appeared under its imprint. Tucker regarded Walker highly, and referred to him as "a radical of rare consistency" who was engaged in a significant effort toward "liberalizing the West."[48]

From this trio, and principally Walker, came the last impetus toward colonizing on the original small basis, "a practical application of the principles of anarchy that shall challenge the attention of the slothful masses." Small groups acting upon the principles of "voluntary mutualism" were necessary, said Walker, if only for the reason that such colonies preserved the radicals, who under ordinary circumstances were quickly coerced into exhibiting conventional behavior and subscribing to conventional attitudes.[49] Lazarus championed the social value of work close to the soil, the avoiding of taxed goods as much as possible, and the creation of a self-supporting economy in such small communities on an industrial as well as agricultural level.[50] A fundamental difference between Walker and Tucker as to the future of the city in America underlay their debate; the former believed that it was doomed, but Tucker was convinced that it was destined to become the permanent center of distribution, in American civilization, not only of material wealth but of nearly everything else.[51]

---

[46] Appleton bitterly opposed the passage of legislation limiting the hours of work as a device of politicians to distract labor leaders from demanding conditions "as will make a free contract possible" between employers and workmen. *Liberty,* III (April 11, 1885), 4. For other discussions of above matters see *Liberty,* III (October 25, 1884), 4; (January 31, 1885), 4; (January 23, 1886, 4.

[47] *Lucifer* grew out of the *Valley Falls Liberal,* a free-thought paper begun in 1880. Tucker and some of his group did not care for *Lucifer* at a later time because of its stress upon sexual relations, and grew to find fault with Walker for his gradual swing toward Harman's point of view, which was somewhat increased due to his marriage to Harman's daughter. During its early years, however, Lucifer was forthright anti-statist in its views. Later anarchists and socialists esteemed Harman to a far greater degree. See for instance the congratulatory letters from Eugene Debs, Alexander Berkman, Emma Goldman and Carl Nold, as "the Nestor of free expression" and for his "noble life work," in *Lucifer,* (April 25, 1907), 71; September 27, 1906), 590. The paper carried no volume numbers at this time. For Walker as a forerunner of the egoistic philosophy, see his "A Plea for Materialism," in *The Index,* VIII (December 13, 1877), 596.

[48] *Liberty,* IV (November 8, 1884), 1.

Granting that Walker's arguments in favor of communities were "forcible and weighty," Tucker called his program "social landscape gardening." The objective of preventing the continual raids and drains upon the radical element was indeed worthy, yet the results of such settling to him appeared bound to experience failure in one way or another:[52]

> Reform communities will either be recruited from the salt of the earth, and then their successes will not be taken as conclusive, because it will be said that their principles are applicable only among men and women well-nigh perfect; or, with these elect, will be a large admixture of semi-lunatics among them . . . society will be unendurable and practical work impossible. . . . It has no interest for me now. I care nothing for any reform that cannot be effected right here in Boston among the every day people whom I meet in the streets.

Tucker was of the opinion that colonies generally failed because of lack of success as productive enterprises. Society at large had generally solved production problems; the problem of their own times was one of distribution, the settlement of which needed only freedom in its process. For this reason he declared his opposition to the Appleton thesis of individual improvement, despite the latter's support in disparaging the renewed interest in colonizing along anarchist lines. In fact, the assumption that the achievement of superior social conditions in the world at large attended an improvement in the character of the world's citizens Tucker put aside as "seriously defective," another statement of the "gospel of goodness." This was not the program of individualist anarchism: "The very gist of our argument and our hope is that freedom once allowed, social conditions steadily improve through the natural working of economic processes, and as a result character improves."[53]

---

[49] *Liberty,* III (July 26, 1884), 8. Walker also proposed the substitution of the word "autonomist" for "anarchist." *Liberty,* IV (July 31, 1886), 7.

[50] *Liberty,* III (October 25, 1884), 5; (December 13, 1884), 5; (January 3, 1885), 8. For Lazarus' defense of the occupancy and use theory of land tenure see "Land Tenure: Anarchist View," in *Fair Play,* I (January 19, 1889), 1, 4; (January 26, 1889), 1, 4. Lazarus wrote under the pseudonym "Edgeworth" for many years, and rarely used his own name except in correspondence.

[51] *Liberty,* III (September 6, 1884), 5, 8. Appleton supported Tucker in his disparaging attitude toward the isolated social experiment. See his "New Jerusalem Reformers," in *Liberty,* III (November 8, 1884), 4-5.

[52] *Liberty,* II (July 26, 1884),1.

Having declared a renewal of the Warrenite tactics no longer of value for their time, and the evolutionary approach of Appleton, and incidentally Yarros, as being apart from the propaganda of anarchism, Tucker went on to attack their stand towards centralization. It was not the physical centralization that was an evil; on the whole, the people at large had greatly benefited from centralization of industry, trade and settlement. It was the centralization of control of these things in the hands of a few which was creating poverty and wretchedness. "The localization needed is not the localization of persons in space, but of powers in persons,—that is, the restriction of power to self and the abolition of power over others." Finance capitalism and the pervasive nature of the state were the enemies, not evil individuals and centralization *per se*. Said Tucker:[54]

> Government makes itself felt alike in city and in country, capital has its usurious grip on the farm as surely as on the workshop, and the oppressions and exactions of neither government nor capital can be avoided by migration. The State is the enemy, and the best means of fighting it can be found in communities already existing.

In line with his diagnosis, the following remedial action was suggested; that in any given city a sizeable number of anarchists begin a parallel economy within the structure of that around them, attempting to include in their ranks representatives of all trades and professions. Here they might carry on their production and distribution on the cost principle, basing their credit and exchange system upon a mutual bank of their own which would issue a non-interest-bearing currency to the members of the group "for the conduct of their commerce," and aid the disposal of their steadily increasing capital in beginning new enterprises. It was Tucker's belief that such a system would prosper within the shell of the old and draw increasing attention and participation from other members of the urban population, gradually turning the whole city into a "great hive of Anarchistic workers." "It is such results that I look forward to," declared Tucker to his associates, "and for the accomplishment of such that I work."[55] It was nearly thirty years before he was to admit that the process of centralization had gone too far, especially in control over finance, for any such remedy as his to become effective even on a limited basis.

Of far more interest and effect ideologically was the impact of the introduction of philosophical concepts of Max Stirner into the Tuckerite camp, principally by James L. Walker and George Schumm, and later, by John Beverley Robinson. Here once more were fought out the issues which split Warren and Andrews at an earlier time, and which caused even more widespread disaffection now, as Tucker became solidly attached to Stirnerism and was promptly deserted by most of his earlier literary aides.

---

[53] *Liberty,* IX (March 4, 1893), 2.
[54] *Liberty,* IV (February 26, 1887), 5.
[55] *Liberty,* II (July 26, 1884), 1.

Schumm, a Boston journalist, was a student of Stirner directly, and was able to communicate his ideas extremely well due to his own remarkable fluency in both German and English.[56] Walker, also a newspaperman, developed the egoistic philosophy independently, and was struck by the similarity with Stirner a few years after he had begun setting down his ideas through the medium of such papers as Tucker's.[56] Tucker immediately saw in egoism distinctly anarchistic elements to which he quickly gave accord, and later acquaintances such as Robinson, and John Henry Mackay, the biographer of Stirner and an anarchist writer of considerable merit himself, strengthened him in his convictions. In some ways his adoption of the newly discussed tenets of egoism was tied up with the understanding of individual sovereignty derived from Warren earlier. Since the latter had dismissed altruism and subscribed to enlightened self-interest as the realistic basis of human conduct, it is not surprising to find his most prominent pupil adhering to a similar philosophy when proposed under different circumstances and in a more abstract manner.

Despite his primary concern with economics, Tucker found the contemplation of ethical matters intriguing, and in his own way probed into the phenomenon of evil as it related to the philosophy of anarchism. His primary search was for an answer to the question "what is wrong?", and that supplied by J. L. Walker, but strained through his Warrenite individual sovereignty convictions, was eminently satisfactory.

The reform movement, said Tucker, was on the whole a negative campaign against wrongs,[58] yet there appeared to be no one within their

---

56. Tucker knew no German for some time, and managed to acquire a painful knowledge of it somewhile later. Schumm was already a wholehearted Stirnerite, but Tucker claimed to have heard of Stirner from another source. For Schumm's view of *Die Anarchisten* by Mackay, see *Liberty,* VIII (August 8, 1891), 2.

57. Walker, although of English birth, had lived in the United States since boyhood, and at the time of his attachment to *Liberty* was the chief editorial writer of the *Galveston Daily News,* having been forced to leave Chicago for Texas because of his health. His pseudonym in most anarchist journals was "Tak Kak." Although writing for Tucker in October, 1884, his first articles on egoism started some time later. For biographical details consult Max Stirner, *The Ego and His Own,* introduction, vii; Walker, *The Philosophy of Egoism,* 69-76. For his articles on egoism in *Liberty* see IV (March 6, 1886), 8; (July 3, 1887), 8; (July 17, 1886), 5; (January 22, 1887), 8; (March 26, 1887), 7; (April 9, 1887), 5-6; (July 2, 1887), 7; V (August 13, 1887), 5.

58. See the discussion under Tucker, "The Anatomy of Liberty," in *Liberty,* I August 6, 1881), 2-3.

ranks capable of furnishing a satisfactory definition for the word itself. The usual basis upon which a thing received condemnation as a "wrong" was the fact that it usually resulted in what was judged to be injustice by some group of individuals. Overlooked in the process was the fact that wrongs to some often worked to the great profit and comfort of larger groups of others, hence destroying any possible method of discovering the nature of a wrong on the sole criterion of injustice. Hence the majority of reforms soon dissipated themselves in struggles between classes which divided along lines of favor versus unprivilege, "selfishness in contact with itself."

The anarchist, on the other hand, defined wrong as "the result of some violation of the law of true liberty," which they further qualified as "spontaneous association by natural selection." Said Tucker: "The basic factor of social existence is that the individual shall be left entirely and absolutely free to regulate his life as experimental contact with other equally free individuals may seem to direct." Thus right and wrong were principles subject to constant re-definition, qualification and circumscription by each individual behaving in his "associative capacity." Therefore action taken either individually or as the result of voluntary association was qualified by the factor of direct responsibility; "under this law all individuals have a right to do anything and everything which they may choose voluntarily to do at their own cost."[59] There was little variation from Josiah Warren in these sentiments.

The consequence of the individual sovereignty position, then, left no alternative to accepting egoism, in the sense of enlightened self-interest, as the only motivating force in human conduct. "As far as motive is concerned, altruism is out of the question,"[60] Tucker flatly stated. Furthermore, superiority came with the increased grasp of this realization, and eventually egoism and liberty became synonyms. The rejection of altruism had other consequences upon anarchists, the principal of which was the abandonment of the concept of obligation, except in the case of being something assumed under voluntary or mutual agreement. Hence the scrapping of the term "duties" as well as "rights." What one might look upon as a right, said Tucker, in reality was a social convention. In fact, here he deviated from the path which the predecessors in the propagation of individualist anarchism had taken, and dismissed the whole concept of natural rights as a myth.[61] Human equality was the only thing anarchists could recognize, and since social order was the desired end, then social expediency was the standard of conduct, and its fundamental precept "the greatest amount of liberty compatible with equality of liberty."

---

[59] Tucker, "The Philosophy of Right and Wrong," in *Liberty,* I (October 29, 1881, 2-3.

[60] *Liberty,* IV (May 7, 1887), 8.

[61] *Liberty,* V (April 28, 1888), 5.

The banishment of moral and "natural" rights from the ethical scene, while at the same time avowing that the stable society was the desirable objective,[62] brought up the specter of the prevalence of might, or pure force, a fact which Tucker willingly admitted. However, the subordination to the strong did nothing toward achieving this end, since the perpetual existence of insecurity undermined any gains effected through the application of mere brute strength. The alternative which anarchism proposed, said Tucker, was contract, "a tacit agreement or understanding between human beings . . . as individuals living in daily contact and dependent upon some sort of coöperation with each other for the satisfaction of their daily wants, not to trespass upon each other's individuality, the motive of this agreement being the purely egoistic desire of each for the peaceful preservation of his own individuality." The great problem before those wishing a world founded upon contract and egoism, rather than one based upon natural rights and altruism, was the difficulty either in demonstrating human frailty to those willing to live by violating these agreements out of confidence in their ability to escape retribution, or due to infractors "through mistaken and superstitious ideas about religion, morality, and duty."[63] The fight to make people see that the free life of the other made theirs that much more free, and that this was best promoted by contracts which in one way or another abrogated invasive powers, this said Tucker, was worth continuing, since nothing else but the rule of force would ever exist in its stead, the concept of natural rights being lofty but meaningless in times of emergency:[64]

> Before contract is the right of might. Contract is the voluntary suspension of the right of might, the power secured by such suspension we may call the right of contract. These two rights—the right of might and the right of contract—are the only rights that ever have been or ever can be. So-called moral rights have no existence.

The ethical transition to intellectual philosophical egoism was now a reality, accompanied by widespread repercussions in the individualist anarchist camp. Four prominent *Liberty* contributors severed their connections with Tucker: Appleton, Lazarus, and John F. and Gertrude B. Kelly, the latter another of several talented women who took part in the movement at one time or another.[65] The desertion of natural rights weakened Lloyd also,[66] but Labadie subscribed to the egoist stand, as did Yarros, for a time. In spite of the fact that Spencerian and egoist philosophies occupied diametrical positions on more than one issue, Yarros was able to reconcile the two. One of the most able statements of the anti-altruist[67] point of view was written by him at the height of the defection, at which time the bulk of the controversy was being carried on by J. L. Walker and John F. Kelly.[68]

---

[62] *Liberty,* V (June 9, 1888), 4-5; VII (August 2, 1890), 4.

[63] *Liberty,* III (March 6, 1886), 8.

[64] *Liberty,* IX (March 4, 1893), 3. At a previous time Tucker explained: "Mankind is approaching the real social contract, which is not, as Rousseau thought, the origin of society, but rather the outcome of a long social experience, the fruit of its follies and disasters. It is obvious that this contract, this social law, developed to its perfection, excludes all aggression, all violation of equality of liberty, all invasion of every kind." *Liberty,* VII (November 15, 1890), 6. See also *Liberty,* VIII (May 16, 1891), 1.

[65] *Liberty,* V (August 27, 1887), 5; (October 22, 1887), 5; VI (October 13, 1888), 4. Appleton later wrote for the *Alarm,* while the Kellys and Lazarus went over to a short-lived anarchist journal, *Nemesis,* later joining Appleton.

The propaganda of egoism and the frontal attack upon altruism and natural rights in individualist circles reached a new peak of vigor in 1891 as far as *Liberty* was concerned. Foremost among the newer writers on the subject was Robinson, an ex-single taxer, land reformer, and anarchist formerly of Tolstoian leanings.[69] In line with the Tucker-Stirner doctrine that individual happiness was the objective of existence Robinson concisely summarized the position as to behavior:[70]

> Virtue is virtue only because it is productive of happiness; vice is vice only because it is productive of unhappiness. At the bottom, moreover, each one is unable to determine what is for the advantage or happiness of another; while each one knows better than anybody else, what is for his own happiness. Therefore at the bottom each action must be judged by the individual as to whether it is conducive to his own happiness, not as to whether it will make somebody else happy. And this applies in its fullest force even to those actions called altruistic, which give pleasure to

---

[66] See Lloyd's criticism of the created rights doctrine in *Liberty,* VI (September 7, 1889), 6-7.

[67] Consult in particular Yarros' articles in *Liberty,* V (August 27, 1887), 7; VI (July 20, 1889), 4; (September 7, 1889), 4. In 1891 Yarros repudiated all his former writing which indicated his Stirnerite leanings, which he described as "monstrously absurd and miserably nonsensical," and egoist philosophy the result of attitudes based on "metaphysical and fallacious conclusions." *Liberty,* VIII (September 26, 1891), 2-3; (October 3, 1891), 2-4; (October 10, 1891), 2-3; (October 17, 1891), 3-4. The controversy with Tucker flared up again in 1895, when Tucker insisted that the anarchist stand on occupancy and use as the basis of land tenure was absolutely in contradiction to Spencer's equal rights tenet, which Yarros now upheld. *Liberty,* X (April 4, 1895), 5. For a defense of Tucker by an associate see Warren E. Brokaw in *The Equitist,* I (July 24, 1897), 4-5.

[68] See note 57. Kelly's replies to Walker can be found in *Liberty,* IV (February 26, 1887), 7; (May 7, 1887), 7-8; (July 30, 1887), 7.

[69] Robinson, with Louis Post and R. Heber Newton, published *The Free Soiler* in New York in 1884, as the organ of the American Free Soil Society. On his background before association with Tucker see *The Free Soiler,* I (June, 1884), 30; Robinson, *The New Christianity,* 15 .

[70] Robinson, "The Limits of Governmental Interference," in *Liberty,* VIII (August 15, 1891), 3-4, probably the best of all summaries of egoism applied to anarchism. Also of merit is his "The Egoist," in *Instead of a Magazine,* I (October 4, 1915), 2-3. This short essay was reprinted repeatedly thereafter, in *Reedy's Mirror* (1915), *Freedom* (1923), *The Road to Freedom* (1929) and *Freedom Through Anarchism* (1946). For his economic ideas, admittedly based on those of Proudhon, see *The Economics of Liberty* and *Rebuilding The World,* one of the better works by anarchists in the United States after the departure of Tucker for Europe in 1908.

> the doer indirectly, although directly they may give pain to the doer and pleasure to somebody else.
>
> A kind action, performed without any sense of gratification to the doer, loses its character as a kind action. If the one who is benefited even suspects that his benefactor is loath to do him the kind act, his appreciation of it gives place to reluctance, or even to resentment. Benevolence is hypocrisy, when prompted by any feeling but personal delight in benevolence. . . . Such most briefly and inadequately sketched, is Egoism.

For a time the philosophy of egoism enjoyed a wide radical audience. Others besides Tucker interested in its propagation entered the field of publication. A California magazine, *Egoism*, published by Georgia and Henry Replogle, provided Walker with an excellent medium of expression,[71] while John Basil Barnhill's *The Eagle and the Serpent* combined the ideas of Stirner, Nietzche and Ibsen, as well as contemporaries of lesser note in America and elsewhere.[72] On the other hand the intellectual partnership of Tucker and Yarros was severely strained by the innovation, Yarros finally declaring his repudiation of Stirnerism and reaffirming his attachment to Spencer's stand on rights. Henceforth *Liberty* presented the arguments of both sides, but Stirner and egoism were definitely on the ascendancy, and remained thus throughout the existence of the periodical. No less important did Tucker consider his connection with its spread. When, with the assistance of Walker[73] and Steven T. Byington, he published an English translation of Stirner's *Der Einzige und sein Eigentum* in 1907, he announced to his readers: "I have been engaged for more than thirty years in the propaganda of Anarchism, and have achieved some things of which I am proud, but I feel that I have done nothing for the cause that compares in value with my publication of this volume."[74]

Although the ethical content of intellectual egoism provided the con-

---

71. The first 12 chapters of Walker's *Philosophy of Egoism* first appeared in *Egoism* between May, 1890 and September, 1891.
72. For mention of *Liberty* and its aims in the propagation of Stirner see *The Eagle and the Serpent*, I (February 15, 1898), 1; II (1902), 79. Barnhill, a native of Xenia, Illinois, later published this paper in England.
73. J. L. Walker provided Tucker with attacks on Spencerian concepts, especially his organismal nature of society theory and his ethics, which Walker labeled "the logic of the crowd." *Liberty*, VIII (November 28, 1891), 4; February 13, 1892), 2-3; *Fair Play*, III (March, 1891), 215-216; Walker, *Philosophy of Egoism*, 38-40.
74. *Liberty*, XVI (April, 1907), 1. Tucker claimed to have refrained from corresponding with Yarros for nearly three decades after 1906, being provoked by the latter's article on anarchism in the January, 1936 issue of the *American Journal of Sociology*. For his repudiation of Yarros see Benjamin R. Tucker to Laurance Labadie, March 13, May 17, September 5, 1936; Benjamin Tucker to Ellsworth Faris, editor of the *American Journal of Sociology*, April 11, 1936, and Ellsworth Faris to Benjamin R. Tucker, April 30, 1936. The first three letters and copies of the last two are in the possession of Laurance Labadie. See also Ishill (ed.), *Free Vistas*, II, 304-307.

troversial material among the Tuckerites, the new personalities affiliating between 1887-1897 were attracted far more because of discussions over economic than philosophical affairs. Land and money reformers predominated among them, and on the whole they subscribed to Tucker's concepts of the monopoly origin of most economic distress. E. H. Simpson supported the charge that there were no natural monopolies, but that all were chartered, and gave evidence of their precarious nature by the incessant traffic between lobbies and governmental officials, attempting to forestall competitors through various types of bribery and corruption. William Hanson, next to Ingalls the most competent of anarchist critics of Henry George, argued in much the same manner with respect to land. The admission that land monopoly was responsible for rent called for the logical remedy, not of taxation, but of repeal of the laws which created a vested interest in the soil: "Take away the protective power of the State and the defenders of vested rights would no longer have the power to enforce their unrighteous claims," Hanson said.[75]

There were other critics of George among the newcomers, although objections tended to revolve around the issue of finance, of great concern to the anarchists and generally neglected by Single Tax economists. An example of this was the brilliant Indianapolis critic Herman Kuehn, himself a single taxer when first associated with *Liberty,* but who later became an outstanding proponent of the mutual banking idea. His principal point was the Georgian justification of interest and the failure to approach the problem of a monopolized medium of exchange. Observed Kuehn, "For more than thirty pages of *Progress and Poverty* George writes of interest, never finding occasion to use the word "credit" at all."[76]

Other predominant money reformers, including Henry Cohen, William Trinkaus, Alfred B. Westrup, and the non-anarchist but sympathetic Philadelphia manufacturer Hugo Bilgram, entered the currency controversy in exhausting detail. Westrup, admittedly influenced by Warren, Heywood and Greene, himself published a free bank paper called *The Auditor* in Chicago in 1891. He strongly condemned Greenbackism and all other fiat money systems whose case rested on the assumption that what the government might designate to be money was money. In *Liberty* he attacked the control of the currency system by the state, especially the effects resulting from the control of its volume. He believed it impossible for the state to know how much money was needed, and hence presumptuous to arbitrarily limit it.[77]

---

[75] Along with Tucker, Simpson disagreed with Ely that nationalization of monopoly under the state was the solution. Hanson, like most of the land reform anarchists, denied that land values were an economic entity, in that they were not the product of land and labor. *Liberty,* IV (February 12, 1887), 8; VI (September 7, 1889), 5; (November 23, 1889), 5.

While some spoke of economics, Gertrude Kelly plumbed public attitudes, and professed to find logical bankruptcy there; "The great fundamental evils are not questioned, the right to increase without work is not questioned, for the spirit of robbery is still to a very great extent the controlling spirit of the times. When the robbery shows itself in a very huge form, when the Vanderbilts and Goulds accumulate their millions, then arises a cry . . . , but not against the system which produces them. There is no cry against interest, profit, rent,—that is, there is no cry against robbery in itself, but only against the amount taken." *Liberty,* IV (July 3, 1886), 7.

[76] Kuehn, *The Problem of Worry: An Insurance Expert's Plan for Practical Commercial Credit Cooperation,* 14. Kuehn's Commercial Credit system was another plan to put Greene's *Mutual Banking* into practice. See also *Liberty,* VI (December 15, 1888), 1.

Cohen also wrote very effectively, being especially attached to Greene's ideas. In Denver he gradually developed a center of considerable interest in anarchist finance, and brought out two editions of Greene's *Mutual Banking* and several other financial tracts in a long period of radical propaganda activity. Of all the writers on money who made use of *Liberty* to express their varied concepts, Bilgram obtained the most respect and attention from Tucker. In *The Iron Law of Wages* he developed the main theme that wages could not be kept down to the cost of the laborer's subsistence were it not for the monopoly by a privileged class of the right to represent wealth by money, thus allowing them to monopolize credit as well. His *Involuntary Idleness,* which Tucker called the best treatise on money and the relation of money to labor written in English since *Mutual Banking,*[78] reached much the same conclusions as Tucker; financial legislation was the real seat of the prevailing social disorder, and that the only way to obtain work for everybody able and willing to work was to abolish the restrictions upon the issue of money. It was his belief, however, that the government could best run a mutual bank system, which Tucker bitterly denied.[79]

The year 1892 saw the association of three of Tucker's most talented compatriots, Steven T. Byington, William Bailie, and Clarence Lee Swartz. Byington, a Vermont-born ex-Single Taxer and former divinity student, was one of the intellects of the movement. A school teacher and master of ten languages, he entered enthusiastically into the campaign to promote the philosophy of anarchism through education.[80] He had great hopes in getting across the idea of the boycott as a substitute for physical coercion, a policy which had long been in force at "Modern Times" under actual living conditions. "Anarchism," said Byington, "has undertaken to change men's minds in one point by removing their faith in force."[81] From his home in Ballard Vale, Mass. he began directing a device previously used by Georgists, a "Letter Writing Corps," in the spring of 1894. This was a group which voluntarily pledged itself to write one letter a week to any address which he as secretary might supply, designated as "targets" for that week, as an avowed propaganda effort to get the doctrines of the scientific anarchists before the general public, especially the daily newspapers. As a regular department in *Liberty* this scheme operated for over three years, with Tucker's hearty approval. Letter writers were encouraged to "steal" ideas from back issues of the paper without fear, since none of its material was copyrighted. The influence of this letter writing extended somewhat beyond the period of its formal sponsorship in *Liberty*.[82]

---

[77] *Liberty,* IV (July 7, 1888), 7; (July 21, 1888), 7-8; VIII (June 27, 1891), 2; (September 12, 1891), 3. For Westrup's tribute to Greene, Heywood and Warren as sources of inspiration see his *The Financial Problem: Its Relation to Labor Reform and Prosperity,* 25-26, and *The New Philosophy of Money,* 7, 49.

Trinkaus, an associate of Westrup, was a frequent contributor to both *Egoism* and *The Age of Thought.*

[78] For Tucker on the two early Bilgram works on money see *Liberty,* IV (July 16, 1887), 1; VI (November 23, 1889), 4. Tucker pointed out to his readers that Bilgram was not an anarchist despite his approval of their money ideas. Bilgram had considerable influence upon the financial writings of a fellow Philadelphian, James Mill, in the 1930's. See the following four pamphlets by Mill: *More Money For Everyone; Privilege and the Effects on Privilege; Monopoly Versus Freedom: A Short Study in Elementary Economics; Some Observations on a Sound Monetary System,* all published in Philadelphia in 1933, and the more extensive *Over-Production and Unemployment: A Plea For Freedom* (Philadelphia, 1940).

[79] See the discussion in *Liberty,* VI (February 15, 1890), 4. Bilgram's *The Cause of Business Depressions,* written in 1914 in collaboration with L. E. Levy, was greatly esteemed as an economics textbook by a later generation of Tuckerites.

Bailie, a native of Manchester, England, came to the United States in the summer of 1891, settling in Boston. A Kropotkinian anarchist for some time, he rapidly became a convert to the American variety, achieving prominence among them somewhat later as the biographer of Warren. It was his conviction that anarchism was a political rather than an economic doctrine, but that it involved the economic aspect of society in as fundamental a manner. Both Spencerian and Stirnerite in outlook, he sought to arrive at a body of principles on which all the individualists might agree, in an ambitious undertaking, "Problems of Anarchism," which ran through 19 lengthy installments in *Liberty* during the first eight months of 1893.[83] In an excellently written essay, "The Anarchist Spirit," inserted as an introduction to his *Josiah Warren,* published 13 years later, he summarized the conclusions of this investigation, as well as placing on record a twentieth century definition of anarchism and his reason why it still had its place in his own time:[84]

---

[80] Byington, a summa cum laude graduate from the University of Vermont, and a Phi Beta Kappa, had also been a Prohibition candidate for office, *Liberty,* IX (December 31, 1892), 1, 3; (April 15, 1893), 3; XII (May 16, 1896), 8. See also Steven T. Byington to Agnes Inglis, September 5, 1947, Labadie Collection.

[81] Byington, "Quasi-Invasion and the Boycott," *Liberty,* X (May 19, 1894), 2.

[82] The Letter Writing Corps as a part of *Liberty* was discontinued in the summer of 1897. For some of its impacts see the Joshua T. Small scrapbook in the Labadie Collection, which contains many clippings from newspapers which published these letters written especially by anarchists. For some of the details of this program consult the Small-Labadie correspondence, in the Labadie MSS.

[83] For biographical material on Bailie, see the sketch by Tucker in *Liberty,* IX (January 7, 1893), 2.

> Modern Anarchism . . . is primarily a tendency—moral, social, and intellectual. As a tendency it questions the supremacy of the State, the infallibility of statute laws, and the divine right of all authority, spiritual or temporal. It is, in truth, a product of Authority, the progeny of the State, a direct consequence of the inadequacy of law and government to fulfill their assumed functions. In short, the Anarchist tendency is a necessity of progress, a protest against usurpation, privilege and injustice.

Swartz, for a time the assistant to Harman in the publication of *Lucifer,* also showed interest in anarchist finance, his later *What Is Mutualism?* being a widely regarded book by fellow anti-statists interested in anarchist economics.[85] With Lloyd and William Walstein Gordak as collaborators, he entered into the publication of two periodicals during one of *Liberty's* several suspensions, *I* and *The Free Comrade,* although the latter approached an eclectic character much like that which Andrews had favored in the early 80's. A proposition to start an anarchist colony at North Scituate, Mass., was considered for a time, but this aspect of the movement was by now completely vitiated. One of the few anarchist publications in actual operation at the time of the McKinley assassination, Swartz' *Free Comrade,* now operated by Lloyd, deplored the act as "terrible folly" and declared that "there is no healing for the sickness of mankind in blood."[86]

Others attempted the task assumed by Bailie in reconciling the many elements which went to make up individualist anarchism as it emerged from the combined influences of Spencerian and Stirnerite doctrines. One of these projected syntheses was the brief outline of Fred Schulder, *The Relation of Anarchism to Organization.* Another was Francis D. Tandy, an associate of Cohen in Denver, whose *Modern Social Tendencies* and *Voluntary Socialism* were anarchist works of considerable repute,[87] showing influence of Tucker, Spencer and Thoreau. Both Tandy and Schulder were recipients of Tucker's approval in their activities along the program of educational propaganda for the anarchist cause.

---

[84] Bailie, *Josiah Warren,* introduction, xii.

[85] *Lucifer,* VIII (November 7, 1890), 2. A recent edition of *What is Mutualism?* has appeared in India, under the imprint of the Modern Publishers of Indore. This undated volume was being distributed in 1945. See also Swartz in *Liberty,* VIII (August 20, 1892), 2-3.

[86] On colonization see *The Free Comrade,* I (May, 1900), 3-5; (September, 1900), 4; (March, 1901), 4-5. For comment on the McKinley shooting see *The Free Comrade,* II (November, 1901), 3-6. While Lloyd was editor, he thought that the reconciliation of the various fragments of the socialist movement was a possibility along lines which Andrews had speculated earlier. *The Free Comrade,* II (July, 1901), 3-5; III (November, 1902), 3-4.

[87] Schulder, *Relation of Anarchism to Organization,* 2-4, 10-15; Tandy, *Modern Social Tendencies,* 1-2, 9. See the review of Tandy's *Voluntary Socialism* by Clarence Lee Swartz in *I,* II (May, 1899), 6-7.

Tucker had four contemporaries of considerable merit in the publication field whose major operations remained apart from his. These men, Dyer D. Lum, Charles T. Fowler, Edward H. Fulton and Ross Winn, backed significant periodical presses in scattered parts of the country, and occasionally featured the same writers appearing in *Liberty*. Fowler, along with Tucker, was a former disciple of Warren in Boston during 1873, and thus received his anti-statism from the original source. Also, like Greene, a dissident Unitarian preacher, he became associated with Heywood and the *Word* shortly thereafter, but left New England to settle in Kansas City, Missouri. From this city he published a periodical, *The Sun,* a work which Tucker endorsed and sold along with his own, and which featured articles on anarchist land and money principles of considerable literary quality.[88]

Lum, one of the most interesting and important figures in the American anarchist movement, established relations with both its major wings during a hectic ten years of association, but always remained close to the individualist philosophy. A native of Geneva, New York, he served as an officer in the Union army during the Civil War, and after Reconstruction entered politics in Massachusetts, as a candidate for lieutenant-governor on the Greenback ticket.[89] His career as a participant in the labor movement grew out of his reflections on the Pittsburgh riots during the 1877 railroad strike, but before Haymarket had swung over to the extreme left position of the anarchists and mutualists, impressed with the possibilities of coöperation in economics.[90]

Following the arrest of Parsons in Chicago, Lum revived the *Alarm* late in 1887, changing much of its editorial policy to fit it in line with that of *Liberty,* in which he had been writing for some time. Henceforth he carried on in the interests of the individualists, dwelling especially on the occupation and use land tenure, and the mutual bank money ideas, in works of his own and in the journals of others.[91] Along with

---

[88] Fowler, "Land Tenure," in *The Sun,* I (May-June, 1887), 1-25. For an early statement of the anarchist stand, see his "Declaration of Independence by the Working People of the United States," in *The Word,* IV (June, 1875), 1.

[89] See biographical article by Voltairine De Cleyre, *Works,* 284-296; same author, "Dyer D. Lum," in *Freethinkers' Magazine,* XI (August, 1893), 497-501. After joining the radical camp, Lum referred to his army service as the period "when I risked my life to spread cheap labor over the South." *Liberty,* IV (July 16, 1887), 5.

[90] It was his viewpoint, when observing the social problem caused by the Mormon question, that the religious and moral objections involved were mere smoke screens thrown up by disgruntled elements, disturbed by Mormon solutions of their economic difficulties through cooperation which dried up sources of income for speculative interests. Even the Mormons themselves, he thought, did not think polygamy versus monogamy the principal issue, but rather, resistance to the business system of the Gentiles. Lum, *The Mormon Question,* 8-23, 81-90.

[91] *Liberty,* V (November 19, 1887), 4; Lum, "The Social Question," in *The Beacon,* I (May 3, 1890), 4; same author, *The Economics of Anarchy, A*

Tucker, he expressed the conviction that force was not necessary to effect a revolution, nor was there any proof that its use was even generally successful. For this he earned the castigation of Most and others of the communist wing for adhering to a "bourgeois scheme," their designation for the individualist program of change through intellectual conviction. As a critic of George and a friend of trade unions he added other material to the literature of the anti-statist group.[92]

Fulton, probably the most obviously influenced by Tucker of all the independents, began his paper, *The Age of Thought,* on July 4, 1896, at the height of a serious depression and hectic political campaign, at a time also when *Liberty* had begun to appear irregularly. Extremely well-written, featuring his own ideas plus those of the Denver group of Tandy, Cohen and William Holmes, Fulton's paper soon acquired a subscriber's list of several thousand, and was easily the best of the separately-sponsored journals. A former advocate of colonization, he now stressed the land for use and free banking propositions, and dismissed the Bryan silver campaign as "a squabble in regard to which of two powerful classes shall exercise an iniquitous privilege," the position of the anarchists with relation to the restriction of the currency to specie, whether gold, silver or both. Fulton's activities as a radical publisher continued for several years after the World War,[93] five different journals appearing under his sponsorship down to 1928.

Winn achieved attention as the outstanding anti-statist writer and publisher in the South, as well as developing a reputation for fiery and vituperative language in his publications which was matched but seldom by any of his confreres elsewhere. He edited and published several in Tennessee and Texas for nearly 15 years, and although he mustered among his contributors such men as Labadie and Charles Erskine Scott Wood, the tone of his philosophy gradually slid over to socialism. Nevertheless he featured reprints of Kropotkin, Emma Goldman, Spooner and

---

Study of the Industrial Type, 15-19, 31-40, 56-58. Commenting on the misuse of the term "crank" by the daily press and conservatives in general as a synonym for radical, Lum remarked "There is no God but Commonplace, and the State is his Prophet. Refuse obeisance to the shrine of the Commonplace, and lo! thou art a 'Crank.'" *Liberty,* III (February 6, 1886), 8; IV (June 1, 1886), 5.

92. *The Arbitrator,* III (April 6, 1889), 2; *Fair Play,* II (May 10, 1890), 100; (May 31, 1890), 117; *The Alarm,* II (March 6, 1886), 2; Lum, *Economics of Anarchy,* 25-40; same author, *Philosophy of Trade Unions,* 17-19. Socialism, derided Lum, was a system under which, once all had been brought to one way of thinking, "incompetency will be able to select competency, or capacity to run the social machine." This was a taunt aimed at orthodox socialists during a period of dispute after the Haymarket affair. *Liberty,* IV (July 16, 1887), 5.

93. *Liberty,* XII (June 27, 1896), 6-7; *Age of Thought,* I (October 10, 1896), 3; I (January 2, 1897), 5; *The Altruist,* XXVII (June, 1895), 22; Fulton, *Land, Money and Property,* 8-9, 13-18. For the anarchist papers published by Fulton after 1918, see Bibliography. By this time his headquarters had been changed from Columbus Junction to Clinton, Iowa.

Tucker, as well as maintaining relations with Francisco Ferrer and Leo Tolstoi. For the picturesque quality of his style and for his wide association with the radical movement, Winn deserves especial mention, as well as an example of Southern protest from the left.[94]

There were a number of other forceful personalities who were part of the native anarchist movement in one or another of several capacities, such as William Whittick, Warren E. Brokaw, Thomas H. Bell, Hugh O. Pentecost, A. G. Wagner, William C. Owen, C. L. James, Charles T. Sprading, Theodore Schroeder, as well as the talented women, Sarah Elizabeth Holmes, Voltairine De Cleyre, Olive Schriner and Miriam Daniels. Without mention of this group the scope of the Tuckerite association is not complete. As a whole, it was an impressive gathering of literary talent engaged for the most part in a common cause, despite a multitude of individual differences.

6. *Liberty As a Journal and Mirror of Contemporary History*

Despite the fact that *Liberty* became the medium through which some 60 persons expressed their views in a formal manner through its long existence, the editorial policy never escaped Tucker's control. This he had intended from the first issue, and occasionally he saw fit to remind associates to whom a free hand in writing what they pleased offered a temptation to influence the paper's policies. At the height of the 1887 controversy Tucker declared to his contributors and subscribers alike, "*Liberty* has always represented its editor, and must continue to do so."[95] It is in this sense that the paper is extremely interesting, as a reflection of Tucker's personality, and thus, as the spotlight of a native radical group upon the history of the nation in his own time.

The wide range of his interests and the intensity of his personal likes and antipathies was displayed in a running editorial commentary in his paper, undoubtedly fully endorsed by the great majority of his readers. The issues, persons and events can be logically arranged only with great difficulty. In the customary editorial columns and in a department of briefs headed "On Picket Duty" the discussion of current affairs from the Tuckerian and anarchist point of view primarily took place, while an occasional pithy contribution to criticism merited separate printing as a pamphlet.

Tucker rarely discussed prominent political figures, although he now and then showed interest in a particular national election. In the 1884 campaign he went as far as to favor Samuel J. Tilden, whom he believed to be "an honest man" and "two-thirds an anarchist," while at the same time reminding anarchists that theirs was the non-voting course.[96] The results of the off-year elections of 1890, however, brought unconcealed expression of pleasure. "The defeat of Cannon, McKinley, and other Republican ringleaders, and the sudden extinction of Reed, Ingalls, Quay, and the rest of the bulldozing tyrants and brazen corruptionists can only gladden and cheer the heart of every real lover of liberty and manhood," he trumpeted.[97]

---

[94] *Winn's Firebrand,* I (December, 1902), 1; II (January, 1903), 7-8; (March, 1903), 2; (May, 1903), 2-4; (December, 1903), 3; *The Coming Era,* I June 21, 1898), 1-2; *Today,* III (September, 1905), 5; *The Firebrand,* III (October 2, 1909), 5; (October 30, 1909), 7; *The Advance,* I (December, 1911), 1; (June, 1912), 4-5; (July, 1912), 8-10.

[95] *Liberty,* V (August 27, 1887), 5.

The unconcern did not extend to issues, on the other hand, in which a lively interest was shown. The move to exclude Chinese immigration was set aside as a "short-sighted demand," aided by monopolists to hide from workers the real reason for their want and increasing insecurity. The usual championing of unpopular causes extended to a defense of the Mormons and their right to establish any social institutions they chose, interference with which was termed an "outrageous invasion of human rights."[98]

Tucker brought down upon himself the wrath of the G. A. R. by supporting the belief that Memorial Day was an "annual show" prepared as a piece of political expediency by "the political Barnums of the Republican Party," in the hopes of exploiting the sensibilities of those who had lost friends and relatives in the war, obtaining their praise and thanks in the process. Internal affairs touching economic matters were favorite topics upon which to dwell. Tucker firmly believed that private competitive businesses could furnish better postal service at less cost than the federal government, and criticism of the postoffice department was a frequent entry. He refused to line up with the Greenback movement because of the insistence upon the right of exclusive issue of money by the central government by their leaders. For a time in 1892 he entertained the hope that the acts imposing taxes upon the issue of state or private bank notes might be repealed, when bills providing for this were introduced by Southern senators.[99]

---

96. *Liberty,* II (June 28, 1884), 1; (October 4, 1884), 1.
97. *Liberty,* VII (November 15, 1890), 1.
98. *Liberty,* I (January 4, 1882), 1; (July 22, 1882), 1. At a later time Tucker ridiculed the inclusion of literacy qualifications to entry in the country as an immigrant. The reasoning that illiteracy implied criminality was logic that would "disgrace a schoolboy," and actually would permit the entry of the same amount of clever criminals while excluding many honest and hard-working people. He believed the measure to be "pure hyprocrisy" on the part of a few who wished to prohibit immigration *per se,* but lacked the courage to state their real intentions. *Liberty,* XII (June 13, 1896), 1.
99. *Liberty,* II (June 9, 1883), 2; (August 9, 1884), 4; V (September 10, 1887), 4. The concern over the bank proposition occurred at the time of the introduction of S. 672 by Senator Isham G. Harris of Tennessee and S. 2027 by Senator Zebulon B. Vance of North Carolina, which intended to repeal "all acts and parts of acts discriminating in taxation against the circulating notes of State banks and state banking associations." They were reported

Strangely enough, Tucker solidly endorsed the income tax provision included in the Wilson-Gorman Tariff Act, declaring in the summer of 1894 that it had "evidently come to stay in American government economy," a "propaganda of discontent by deed of legislators forced to yield to popular feeling." Interpreted Tucker:[100]

> Under present conditions of monopoly and plutocracy tempered by spoliation, the favor of the income tax with politicians is a sign of progress. We are at least sure of getting rid of the sickening cant of the Danas and spread-eagle orators about the absence of classes and the cheerful payment of taxes in this country. An income tax . . . is a recognition of the fact that industrial freedom and equality of opportunity no longer exist here even in the imperfect state in which they once did exist.

On the other hand he kept up a characteristic irreverence toward Theodore Roosevelt and the "trust busting" campaign. It was Tucker's stand that Roosevelt was "hopelessly inconsistent" in maintaining that the tariff and trust problems were distinct and should remain apart. Protection by tariff walls sheltered and bolstered the very combines he sought to disintegrate, therefore Tucker believed that regardless of the amount of government regulation and supervision, it "would not effect them in the least."[101]

The early 90's saw a noticeable increase in the volume of current political and social questions argued in *Liberty,* and an accompanying decline in controversies of a theoretical nature. Tucker showed his characteristic sympathy for laborers involved in industrial disputes while maintaining his skepticism toward unionization.[102] He backed every prominent strike which came to his attention, including the Pacific Mills strike of April, 1882 in Lawrence, Mass. and that of the telegraph operators in the summer of 1883, the miners and railroad men involved in the Cripple Creek strike in the early summer of 1894, and the much better known Homestead and Pullman strikes. Although not an admirer of the Populists, he thought them worthy of support, declaring that their struggle against "plutocracy" was commendable.[103] He singled out for

---

on adversely by the Committee on Finance and postponed indefinitely. *Congressional Record,* 52 Cong., 1 Sess., XIII, 1583. For Tucker's comment see *Liberty,* VIII (June 25, 1892), 1.

[100] *Liberty,* X (July 14, 1894), 1.

[101] *Liberty,* (XIV (February, 1903), 6.

[102] Tucker had gone on record as unsatisfied with the labor movement as early as 1886. He upbraided his colleagues Appleton and Labadie for their sympathy with the Knights of Labor, and looked forward to its collapse. "If the next great labor organization that rises from the ashes of the Knights of Labor shall take a further step from politics, it will do so only because more men see the folly of compromise." *Liberty,* IV (June 1, 1886), 4-5.

[103] *Liberty,* I (April 1, 1882), 2; II (August 25, 1883), 1; X (June 16, 1894), 1; (June 30, 1894), 5. The proposition of E. L. Godkin in the *Nation* of July 19, 1883 to forbid any strike of public service employees was to Tucker the final admission that the freedom of contract argument, used to distinguish Northern workers from the slaves during the Civil War, was a myth, and

particular mention their stand in defense of Coxey's "Commonweal Army." Tucker considered that the daily press was collective guilty of "pure and malicious falsehood" in describing this group as a body of professional tramps. Although frowning on Coxey's public works plan, Tucker considered him a man of brains, character and great determination.[104]

There was no doubt as to where the sympathies of Tucker and Yarros lay during the Pullman strike in particular. For one thing they believed that the idea of employees as individuals making contracts with monopolies was now completely discredited, and shown to be a thinly disguised procedure of legal injustice. Tucker refused to place any stock in the stories of violence and aggression attributed to the strikers, and at best believed that what incidents of this type had occurred had been instigated by the company. Said Tucker:[105]

> To those who shriek that labor is criminal we say that capital is far more criminal. Monopoly's tears excite no sympathy. . . . Monopoly cannot expect to retain a monopoly of the weapon of force forever. Labor is slow, but it is gradually learning the tricks of monopoly and will master the whole science before long.

Tucker approved of Altgeld's stand, and thought his treatment by the newspapers "shameful" and "stupid." He castigated the Senate for its enthusiastic support of Cleveland's interference decision, yet through all his championing of the strikers did not abuse Pullman, whom he looked upon simply as one of the many monopolists who had become rich because of state protection.[106]

On learning of the arrest of Eugene V. Debs on conspiracy charges Tucker wrote, "No court in this country has ever rendered a more iniquitous decision or one more far-reaching in its evil possibilities than that of Judge Woods of the United States Circuit Court in the Debs case," flatly declaring that the principle that restraint of trade accomplished by conspiracy was unlawful was false, another device utilized to make striking workmen innocuous:[107]

---

not even accorded much credence even from those who proclaimed it the loudest. Godkin, "The Theatened Strike of the Telegraphers," in *Nation,* XXXVII (July 19, 1883), 46-47; *Liberty,* II (August 25, 1883), 1.

[104] *Liberty,* IX (May 5, 1894), 5.

[105] *Liberty,* X (July 28, 1894), 3-4. Twelve years before, Tucker wrote, "Strikes, whenever and wherever inaugurated, deserve encouragement from all true friends of labor. They give evidence of life and spirit and hope and growing intelligence. They show that the people are beginning to know their rights, and knowing, dare maintain them." *Liberty,* I (April 15, 1881), 1.

[106] Tucker believed that Altgeld would have received the Democratic nomination in 1896 if the barrier of foreign birth had not stood in the way. Of the liberal reform group, he held Altgeld in highest esteem, along with Henry Demarest Lloyd, "one of the most sincere, honorable, brave, and generous." *Liberty,* X (July 28, 1894), 1, 5; XII (August 1, 1896), 4; XIV (November, 1906), 6.

[107] *Liberty,* X (December 29, 1894), 3.

> One by one the authorities are stripping the laborers of all their peaceful and non-invasive weapons, determined to leave them only the ballot and the bomb, both of which are weapons of invasion and neither of which can help them in the slightest.

Debs' later conviction and imprisonment he used as an object lesson of the use being made of the state by its benefactors: "The spectacle of Debs in jail will be an eye-opener to thousands,"[108] he remarked, predicting even greater invasion of workingmen by corporations through manipulation of the courts.

Tucker's dislikes are best appreciated by noting their universality. The development of antipathy toward such diversified personalities as the sociologist Albion W. Small, William Randolph Hearst, the historian Hermann Von Holst, E. L. Godkin of the *Nation,* the National Association of Manufacturers, A. Lawrence Lowell and the economist-historian Richard T. Ely, along with those already discussed, points to a well-rounded acquaintance with contemporaries, even if the relationship was primarily negative and critical.[109]

The world-wide intellectual struggle of the anarchist against the state has occasionally been complicated by recourse to violence and assassination, the motives of which have been obscure. In some cases idealism has been the underlying incentive, especially in political killings where the belief that a tyrant is being eliminated dominates the assassin. Whatever may have been the attending circumstances, anarchism and violence have become popularly understood as interchangeable as a result of a spectacular series of such actions between 1880 and 1905 in particular. The anarchist argument that mere brushes between the armed forces of two states often cause more loss of life than the total of all anarchist-inspired slayings has not obtained any noticeable attention, and by and large the concern of non-revolutionary anarchists has generally been to disavow their relation with those implicated in the killing of politically prominent persons. It is with this approach that *Liberty* and Tucker afford an interesting study when related to the outstanding assassinations and demonstrations of violence of American origin during the period mentioned above.

Tucker, it will be remembered, had been an apologist for the Nihilist program in Russia in the first few years of his editorship, during which time he shared and reflected the idealism which permeated the young revolutionaries in that country and elsewhere in Europe. During this same period the shooting of President Garfield occurred, at which time the objective stand toward sensational demonstrations of this type first began to be formulated, an example of his realism when confronted with a concrete situation at home similar to those which were drawing his approval in Russia. "For the Guiteau style of assassination we have no apology," explained Tucker, at the same time expressing wonder at the change in the popular attitude toward a man whom the majority just a short time before were labeling a "bribed man and a perjurer." It was this that convinced him that the man was not receiving sympathy, but that the abstraction of the office Garfield held was what the mourners were revering by their concern. Tucker thought Guiteau insane, as did Spooner, but Tucker was more concerned with displaying Guiteau as a product of statism. He ridiculed the stand of the clergy on the case, declaring that Guiteau's assertion to being "the Lord's partner" in the killing of the President rested on grounds "every bit as good as John Calvin's or Moses'." His execution was deplored as thoroughly as was the previous act of violence.[110]

---

[108] *Liberty,* XI (June 15, 1895), 1.

[109] *Liberty,* XI (January 25, 1896), 1; XIV (May, 1903), I; VII (May 14, 1892), 2-3; III (December 15, 1883), 2-3; IV (July 3, 1886), 1; (July 30, 1887), 1.

The approach to Haymarket, as we have seen, was very similar to this in that both the violence and the police action were condemned, even though the sympathy of Tucker and his group was unmistakably for the arrested men, whom he always regarded as innocent. Tucker saw Spooner's *Trial by Jury* vindicated by the Chicago anarchist trial, in that choice by lot from the city's entire population should have guaranteed the presence of workingmen on the jury, a matter which he thought the prosecution carefully avoided by sifting from a selected panel.[111] He called the judicial opinion at the time of condemnation "a mixture of lies, misrepresentations and idiocy," and remained convinced that Spies, Parsons and Fischer were tried and convicted for their opinions. *Liberty* contained an impressive tribute to their memory the issue following the execution, and Tucker sponsored anniversary memorials in Boston at which time resolutions condemning the police and legal action in the case were proposed. The pardoning of Fielden, Schwab and Neebe by John P. Altgeld in June, 1893, Tucker hailed as "the bravest act standing to the credit of a politician since Horace Greeley bailed Jefferson

---

[110] *Liberty,* I (September 3, 1881), 3; "Sinister Sorrow," in I (October 1, 1881), 2; "Guiteau's Malice," in I (December 10, 1881), 2; "Guiteau's 'Devilish Depravity,'" in I (December 24, 1881), 2; "God's Wicked Partner," in I (February 18, 1882), 2; (July 22, 1882), 3.

[111] *Liberty,* IV (September 18, 1886), 5. This matter remained prominent in Tucker's mind thereafter, and re-appeared ten years later. In a speech delivered in Cooper Union on June 25, 1896, and sponsored by several labor unions, Tucker placed before his audience his conception of a new New York state jury law which permitted the hand-picking of juries in two of the state's counties. This law, which allowed for the dismissal of anyone opposed to the death penalty, Tucker contended was intended to stack cases involving litigation by workingmen against corporations, growing out of injuries sustained at work. *Liberty,* XIII (March, 1899), 1. For the address, "A Blow at Trial By Jury," see *Liberty,* XIII (July, 1897), 3-4; (August, 1897), 2-5. It was separately published as a pamphlet of 46 pages in 1898, from the same type faces used in *Liberty.*

Davis." "He has done nobly, and his shall be our gratitude," the anarchist editor promised.[112]

Altgeld's decision required all the courage Tucker credited him with, for the season of violence was still at hand, the shooting of Henry C. Frick by Alexander Berkman having taken place at the height of the Homestead labor struggle less than a year before. Here again Tucker took the central position, with a variant. The grief and indignation attending Frick's injury Tucker said he could not share: "Henry C. Frick is a conspicuous member of the brotherhood of thieves . . . yet I am very sorry that he has been shot." He thought Berkman, at that time a complete stranger, one with whom he had much more in common than Frick, although in reality a greater menace:[113]

> The worst enemy of the world is folly, and men like Berkman are its incarnation. It would be comparatively easy to dispose of the Fricks, if it were not for the Berkmans. The latter are the hope of the former. The strength of the Fricks rests on violence; now it is to violence that the Berkmans appeal. The peril of the Fricks lies in the spreading of the light; violence is the power of darkness. If the revolution comes by violence, and in advance of light, the old struggle will have to be begun anew. The hope of humanity lies in the avoidance of that revolution by force which the Berkmans are trying to precipitate. No pity for Frick, no praise for Berkman, such is the attitude of *Liberty* in the present crisis.

From this time on, Tucker had many opportunities to defend anarchism from its definition as a cult of crime. One of the better of his treatises of this type is *Are Anarchists Thugs?,* which contained, among other things, a breakdown of the subscription list of *Liberty* according to occupation or profession. This proved to be quite flattering as an indication of the quality of the individualist anarchist persuasion, justifying the Tuckerite contention that anarchism was first of all a variety of political belief.

---

[112] *Liberty,* V (September 24, 1887), 1; IX (July 1, 1893), 2. The issue of *Liberty* for November 19, 1887 was arresting. Below the date line, the entire front page was blank with the exception of a dedicatory poem to the Haymarket men placed in the center of the page. Yarros visited Fielden, Schwab, and Neebe in Joliet prison while on a speaking tour in the Chicago area in February, 1891. He declared that the men had admitted to him their loss of faith in the methods of the "revolutionary communists." *Liberty,* VI (March 7, 1891), 4.

[113] *Liberty,* VIII (July 30, 1892), 2. Late in 1898 the Alexander Berkman Defense Association, through Justus Schwab and Emma Goldman, approached Tucker in the hope that he might add his weight to a petition to Andrew Carnegie pleading to have Berkman's sentence commuted. Tucker agreed to comply only on the condition that an admission be made that the attack on Frick was henceforth repudiated as a policy, thus helping to bring about "a state of public feeling that will insure enlarged opportunity for peaceful evolution of opinion." His proposal was rejected by the committee almost at once. See the correspondence of the committee to Tucker of December 7 and December 13, 1898, and Tucker's letter to the committee, December 11 of the same year, in *Liberty,* XIII (January, 1899), 8.

Tucker sailed for Europe on one of his periodic visits in August 1901, and *Liberty* was suspended for over a year thereafter, hence commentaries on the McKinley assassination do not exist. The fight to distinguish the individualist program from that of the propaganda-by-action group and spectacular isolated participants in violence was conducted in his absence by Henry Bool, a 30 year resident of Ithaca, N. Y., and recent adherent, but his attempt to justify the innocence of the Tuckerites was hopeless. By this time the stigma anarchism has borne to the present day had been firmly impressed in Europe as well as in America.[114]

Liberty in Tucker's hands profited from his experience as a journalist, and continued to do so during his more than twenty years of employment on Boston and New York publications. His own paper was not a money-making proposition. Most of the contributors had other jobs, and material was submitted free. Tucker announced to his readers in 1888, "Neither the publisher of *Liberty* nor any of his co-workers get any reward for their labor beyond the pleasure of its performance."[115]

Within a year after the appearance of its first issue, the anarchist broadsheet had the reputation of being probably the most radical and revolutionary paper in the country. By its fifth year it was internationally read, with a circulation covering all of western Europe and points as distant as Australia. Circulation figures are obscure. In July, 1886 Tucker declared that it was being mailed to at least a thousand favorite subscribers.[116] It is probable that it gradually declined during the 90's, but there is little doubt of its unusual vitality from 1886-1889. During this period it reached its peak as an organ of native anarchist expression, while the radical press as a whole was undergoing a serious decline in numbers and activity.[117] This was the time when such representative statements of American anarchist theory and philosophy as Yarros' *Why*

---

[114] Bool began reading anarchist literature after Haymarket, adhering to its philosophical content despite his standing as a local merchant. Bool, *Liberty Without Invasion, Means and End of Progress,* 17; same author, *Henry Bool's Apology For His Jeffersonian Anarchism,* 9. See also *Henry Bool's Creed* (a leaflet) (n.p., n.d.); and *Who's Who? A Discussion Between an Autocratic Democrat and a Government-By-Consent Anarchist—Being An Editorial From Ithaca Democrat of October 24, 1901, and Remarks On the Same By the Other Fellow* (a leaflet) (n.p., n.d.).

Bool returned to England, the country of his birth, where he published his *For Liberty; The World's Thinkers on Government, Political Power and Democracy, Freedom, Co-operation, and Society Without Government* (London, n.d.).

[115] *Liberty,* VI (September 1, 1888), 1. Tucker was employed on the *Boston Globe* from 1878 to 1889. He became editor of the *Engineering Magazine* in New York from 1892 to 1899, also holding the post of associate editor of the *New York Home Journal* from 1896-1899.

[116] *Liberty,* IV (July 17, 1886), 1; XI (November 2, 1895), 2.

[117] The collapse of *John Swinton's Paper* was followed by the Single Tax *Winsted* (Conn.) *Press, The Alarm,* the London *Radical,* the *Denver Labor Enquirer* and the San Francisco *People,* between August, 1887 and the late spring of 1888. The ephemeral nature of the labor and radical press as a whole is one of the chief vexations of the social historian.

I Am An Egoist and *Anarchism: Its Aims and Methods,* as well as Tucker's *State Socialism and Anarchism* and *Why I Am An Anarchist* were published.[118]

The long theoretical contest with the state brought *Liberty* into surprisingly few actual controversies with its tangible arms. Tucker sold as well as wrote and published radical and liberal materials, one item which constituted an objectionable work in Boston being Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass.* The suppression of this in Boston in the spring of 1882 Tucker called "a shameful satire upon our laws," especially the pressure upon his publisher to refuse further copies until desired deletions had been made.[119] Tucker responded by publishing an unexpurgated edition, and began publicly selling it in Boston in a type of test case action, defying the district attorney's office. "The authorities must now bring the question to an issue, or confess their defeat,"[120] he pointed out, and later that summer, remarked with pleasure that nothing had been done about it. The campaign lost much of its vigor mainly through this stand. Whitman expressed his appreciation later when he wrote: "Tucker did brave things for *Leaves of Grass* when brave things were rare. I couldn't forget that."[121] Another notable instance was the banning from the mails in the summer of 1890 of a translation of *The Kreutzer Sonata* by Leo Tolstoi on orders from Postmaster-General John Wanamaker. This ruling met only passive resistance, as Tucker remarked that he enjoyed "a partial liberty of speech," and wished to retain it, as it was his "only weapon of warfare against existing evils."[122]

Liberty assumed importance as a medium for the acquaintance of a portion of the radical group with a literary bent with translations of libertarian works of Russian, French, and German origin. This included Tchernychevsky's *What's To Be Done?,* Felix Pyat's *Ragpicker of Paris,* excerpts from the work of Mackay, who was the author of *Stürm* and *Die Anarchisten,* as well as a biography of Max Stirner, and others.[123]

---

[118] *Liberty,* V (August 27, 1887), 6-7; (December 3, 1887), 6-8; (March 10, 1888), 2-3, 6. *State Socialism* appeared in other editions, as a pamphlet by Tucker (New York, 1899), and in editions by A. C. Fifield (London, 1911), and Charles W. Bergman (Alpine, Michigan, 1913). For *Why I Am An Anarchist,* see *Twentieth Century Magazine,* IV (May 29, 1890), 5-6 and the private editions of Joseph Ishill (Berkeley Heights, N.J., 1934), and Laurance Labadie (Detroit, 1934), on the 80th anniversary of Tucker's birth.

[119] *Liberty,* I (May 27, 1882), 1.

[120] *Liberty,* I (July, 1882), 1.

[121] Horace Traubel, *With Walt Whitman in Camden,* I, 56. For a recollection by Tucker on his relations with Whitman, see his article in the New York *Herald,* Paris edition, November 23, 1930.

[122] *Liberty,* VII (August 16, 1890), 4.

[123] *What's To Be Done?* was printed serially between May 17, 1884 and May 1, 1886. Tucker, who translated it from French, declared to his readers that "The Russian Nihilists regard it as a faithful portraiture of themselves." Tucker met Mackay in Europe while visiting in the summer of 1889. Mackay visited his American friends in 1893, returning to Germany in

Tucker announced an ambitious plan to publish the entire works of Proudhon in English, but it was only partially realized. Translation led to further contact with overseas correspondents, who furnished interesting commentaries to the paper from several countries. Among these were George Bernard Shaw, Sophie Raffalovich from Paris, Octave Berger from Belgium, Mackay from Germany, D. A. Andrade from Australia, Wordsworth Donisthorpe from England, and a brilliant series of communications on the Italian scene written expressly for Tucker from Florence by the famed political economist Vilfredo Pareto.[124] An attempt on the part of Tucker to supply a literary journal entirely devoted to translations of European literature, *The Transatlantic,* was abandoned after the publication of 16 issues between October, 1889 and June, 1890.

Upon assuming the editorship of the *Engineering Magazine* in New York in 1892, Tucker moved *Liberty* there from Boston. Henceforth the paper experienced varying and steadily declining fortunes. It slipped from weekly to fortnightly and then to monthly issue between this time and 1897, when Tucker announced that thereafter it would have an irregular publication date. This continued until 1905, when regular bimonthly publication went into effect for the remainder of its existence. An attempt to publish a German edition earlier under the direction of Schumm also proved abortive, and Robert Reitzel's *Der Arme Teufel,* the German language paper published in Detroit, continued to be practically the only organ of the non-English speaking radicals in which any of Tucker's philosophy might be read.[125]

October of that year. Translations of Mackay's poems by Harry Lyman Koopman had begun appearing in *Liberty* the year before. *Liberty,* VI September 7, 1889), IX (October 9, 1893), 4.

[124] *Liberty,* IV (January 1, 1887), 4; VI (September 29, 1888), 6-7; (November 10, 1888), 5; (January 5, 1889), 7-8; (October 5, 1889), 6-7; VII (November 15, 1890), 2; (January 2, 1891), 3; (March 7, 1891), 3; VIII August 20, 1892), 2.

Along with literary criticism and translations and quotations from Zola, Ibsen, Tolstoi, Hardy, and Maupassant, Tucker published a 26 column review of Max Nordau's *Degeneration* by George Bernard Shaw, in the issue of July 27, 1895, which was later reprinted as a 114 page pamphlet titled *The Sanity of Art.* Tucker claimed to have introduced Shaw to American readers for the first time with this article, which took up an entire issue of the paper. See George Bernard Shaw to Joseph Ishill, April 16 and September 23, 1936; Benjamin R. Tucker to Rose Freeman Ishill and Joseph Ishill, January 3, 1935 and July 27, 1936, in Ishill (ed.), *Free Vistas,* II, 273-278.

[125] In addition to *Der Arme Teufel* see Robert Reitzel, *Das Reitzel-Buch* (Detroit, 1900), and *Des Armen Teufel; Gesammelte Schriften* (3 vol. Detroit, 1913). For biographical material consult Adolf E. Zucker, *Robert Reitzel* (Philadelphia, 1917); same author, "A Monument to Robert Reitzel: *Der Arme Teufel,* Berlin," in *The Germanic Review,* XX (April, 1945), 147-152. See also the sketch by John Hubert Greusel, " 'The Poor Devil,' A Memory of Robert Reitzel," in *Detroit News-Tribune,* September 16, 1900. This was later reprinted in pamphlet form by Labadie in 1909.

7. *The Decline of Individualist Anarchism as a Conscious Movement*

Tucker's prestige as an authority and spokesman in American anarchist circles advanced as the physical importance of his paper declined. His lectures on the philosophy of the individualist group brought him a large measure of public attention from time to time. One of his better-known public debates, with the Christian Socialist W. D. P. Bliss and President E. Benjamin Andrews of Brown University, arguing for governmental regulation, occurred at a Unitarian Ministers' Institute gathering in Salem, Mass., October 14, 1890, where his address "The Relation of the State to the Individual" summarized the stand of the anti-statist persuasion of native origin. In 1893, at the insistence of associates, a compilation of his articles during a twelve year period was published in a volume titled *Instead of a Book*. Although intended as a propaganda document in the cause, this has since been used in good faith by outsiders interested in obtaining an objective understanding of the movement, unaware that significant material was omitted from its contents.[126]

Tucker characterized himself in later years as "an extreme representative of one of the two great sociological tendencies that today divide the world,"[127] and it was in this capacity that he increasingly achieved prominence. The high water mark of this repute was his appearance as the spokesman for anarchism at the Conference on Trusts held by the Chicago Civic Federation late in the summer of 1899. On September 14 he delivered his famous *The Attitude of Anarchism Toward Industrial Combinations,* an address which John R. Commons described as "the most brilliant piece of pure logic" heard during the duration of the several days' assembly of nationally-prominent speakers.[128] In an environment in which his fellow speakers shared the conviction that the remedy for the trust problem lay in the extension of governmental restriction and supervision, Tucker presented in concise form his "four monopolies" argument, which had been in the process of definition since its presentation in the first issue of his paper over 18 years before.

---

[126] Advance subscriptions from 24 states and 5 foreign countries amounting to 700 copies had been received by the time publication, in mid-March, 1893. Although this volume was examined, all citations from Tucker or *Liberty* in this monograph are from a chronological examination of a complete file of the 403 issues of the paper, between August, 1881 and April, 1908. Tucker considered Eltzbacher's *Anarchism* "the best book on anarchism ever written by an outsider." Benjamin Tucker to Henry Bool, May 1, 1901, Tucker MSS., Labadie Collection.

For a report of the speech at Salem, see *Liberty,* VII (November 15, 1890), 5-6.

[127] *Liberty,* XIV (November, 1905), 2.

[128] For the first publication of this address see *Liberty,* XIV (September, 1899), 4; (November, 1899), 5. See also the second appearance in *Liberty,* XIV (December, 1902), 2-4. Separate pamphlet publications appeared twice, one by Tucker, (New York, 1903), and a private edition, (Detroit, 1933), as well as the official appearance under the auspices of the Conference, *Chicago Conference on Trusts,* 253-261.

Basically, the argument presented centered around the assertion that the trusts of their time were not the result of competition, but due to the denial of competition through other than economic means. Tucker declared that trusts were creatures of the state, and that the vast accumulations of wealth which they represented were due to "the only means by which large fortunes can be rolled up,—interest, rent, and monopolistic profit." Monopolies were created by the state through patent, copyright and tariff legislation, through the system of land grants and centralization of finance in the hands of a few. Said Tucker: "Of these four monopolies—the banking monopoly, the land monopoly, the tariff monopoly, and the patent and copyright monopoly, the injustice of all but the last-named is manifest even to a child," and proceeded to spend over a third of his alloted time in demonstrating that the justification of property in ideas grew out of the justification of property in concrete things, a far different matter. "We have made of property a fetich," he declared, and the fact that two people were unable to physically occupy the same material object was carried over to ideas; "Perpetual property in ideas, then, which is the logical outcome of any theory of property in abstract things, would, had it been in force in the lifetime of James Watt, have made his direct heirs the owners of at least nine-tenths of the now existing wealth of the world," while the consequences of its enforcement since the time of the invention of the Roman alphabet were equally fantastic.[129]

He concluded by re-emphasizing his belief that the money monopoly was the most serious, and that "perfect freedom in finance would wipe out nearly all the trusts." Refusing to support any program of interference or anti-trust legislation, he persisted in his description of them as "systems of a social disease originally caused and persistently aggravated by a regimen of tyranny and quackery" and adhering to the anarchist remedy:[130]

> Free access to the world of matter, abolishing land monopoly; free access to the world of mind, abolishing idea monopoly; free access to an untaxed and unprivileged market, abolishing tariff monopoly and money

---

[129] Tucker, *The Attitude of Anarchism Toward Industrial Combinations,* 11-18. The anarchist theory of the origin of trusts as a logical consequence of the decay of competition must be understood in the light of their interpretation of terms, as in the case of the concept of "competition." Although "trust" and "monopoly" are often used interchangeably, the anarchist defends his position that the trust is the result of the establishment of the monopoly. This may appear in the form of a land title, franchise, charter or other type of grant through legislative creation, and allowing favored position as the result of control of markets in a geographical area, an overwhelming portion of raw materials, or, as they perennially pointed out, control of the medium of exchange and its consequent delegation into the hands of a few.

[130] Tucker, *Atttiude of Anarchism,* 20.

> monopoly,—secure these, and all the rest shall be added unto you. For liberty is the remedy of every social evil, and to Anarchy the world must look at last for any enduring guarantee of social order.

Despite the abstraction of his argument, which Commons and others believed disqualified it as an expedient solution to the trust problem, the immediate reason for the Conference, the daily press of both Chicago and New York commented in a favorable manner upon his address.

The destruction by fire in April, 1908 of Tucker's book shop and publication offices did more than bring to an end the appearance of *Liberty*. It destroyed the central office of expression of the whole individualist anarchist group, and brought about the departure of Tucker himself to France that same year, where he remained until his death in Monaco in 1939. That the cohesion of intellect which had characterized the group in the 70's and 80's had badly deteriorated long before the fire was apparent from the irregular appearance of their most famous journal. This had been augmented by defections to socialism and other portions of the radical front as well as by the internal disputes over Stirner, Spencer, and the collectivist wing of anti-statism. Being uninsured, the property was a total loss, and Tucker took advantage of family financial aid to go to Europe, where he had serious intentions of reviving his publication of anarchist literature. As the possibility of meeting the heavy expense involved grew fainter, Tucker gradually lost enthusiasm, and in a postscript to a 1911 London edition of his *State Socialism and Anarchism,* he admitted that the anarchist solution for monopoly and the centralization of economic power in the hands of a minority was no longer applicable. Explaining his stand, he pointed out that when he wrote this "essay," 25 years before, "the denial of competition had not yet effected the enormous concentration of wealth that now so gravely threatens social order," and that a policy of reversal of monopoly practices might have stopped the process of accumulation. Looking at the conditions of 1911, however, he found the way "not so clear," since the tremendous capitalization now effected made monopoly a convenience, but no longer a necessity. Admitted Tucker, "The trust is now a monster which . . . even the freest competition, could it be instituted, would be unable to destroy," since upon the removal of all existing restrictions on competition, "concentrated capital" could set aside a sacrifice fund to remove any new competitors and continue the process of expansion of reserves.[131]

It was his firm conviction still that monopolies could be eliminated in a permanent manner only by the economic solutions proposed by anarchism, even though they had "passed for the moment beyond their reach." Therefore, he concluded that the problem of the trusts "must be grappled with for a time solely by forces political or revolutionary," which he thought would take the course of forcible confiscation either through the machinery of government, "or in defiance of it." Until the "great levelling" did occur, however, the anarchist solution of free competition, free access to land and raw materials, free banking and free trade, and the exchange of equivalents instead of profit-making, all these he thought might be preserved by teaching to the coming generation. It was up to anarchists to remain outside the struggle, and to take no part in the matter in the hope of accelerating the destruction of monopoly finance capitalism:[132]

---

[131] Tucker, *State Socialism* (1911 ed.), 29.

> . . . education is a slow process, and for this reason we must hope that the day of readjustment may not come too quickly. Anarchists who endeavor to hasten it by joining in the propaganda of State Socialism or revolution make a sad mistake indeed. They help to so force the march of events that the people will not have time to find out, by the study of their experience, that their troubles have been due to the rejection of competition. If this lesson shall not be learned in season, the past will be repeated in the future . . .

Tucker became even more pessimistic at a later date, blaming technology as well as centralization for the ills of mankind. In a letter to Clarence Lee Swartz, July 22, 1930, while referring to the somber *Scènes de la Vie Future* by Georges Duhamel, Tucker wrote, "The matter of my famous "Postscript" now sinks into insignificance; the insurmountable obstacle to the realization of Anarchy is no longer the power of the trusts, but the indisputable fact that our civilization is in its death throes. We may last a couple of centuries yet; on the other hand, a decade may precipitate our finish. . . . The *dark* ages sure enough. The Monster, Mechanism, is devouring mankind."[133]

Without a central clearing house, the individualist anarchist movement broke up into several small circles, in Detroit, Phoenix, Arizona, Los Angeles, Minneapolis and elsewhere. Many of the Tucker associates, Byington, Labadie, Kuehn, Cohen, Swartz, Fulton, Robinson, and allied libertarians, such as Sprading and Warren Brokaw, continued a program of written propaganda which was temporarily interrupted by the World War, only to commence again immediately after and gradually decline into the obscurity of the depression of 1929-1939. Tucker abandoned his anti-war stand in 1915 to support the Allies and particularly France, his several visits there having endeared him to the land and its people, of which he was now a part.[134] The post-war disillusionment destroyed his enthusiasm over wartime objectives. In a letter to the New Bedford *Standard,* September 15, 1922, he declared that "those who fought intelligently in the World War fought, not to make the world safe for democracy, but to make the world safe from democracy, and from every other political or social tyranny. That victory is not yet won, and may never be."[135] Beyond a measure of support for Sacco and Vanzetti,[136] Tucker's interest in radicalism in the United States was now fairly well dissipated. But as he approached and then passed his eightieth birthdate, Tucker still retained his skill in making the pithy remark and the piercing observation. Writing to Ewing C. Baskette from his Monaco villa, he mentioned that his health was failing, and countering, "But I may live a long time yet." He grieved the sudden death of his old friend of nearly a half-century, John Henry Mackay, whose sudden demise in Berlin on May 16, 1933 went unnoticed otherwise. In remarking on a bit of new post office bureaucracy which annoyed him, he observed, "The State always goes from good to bad, and from bad to worse." Selling Baskette a copy of William B. Greene's *Fragments* resulted in a tribute: "I owe to him my appreciation of the giant Proudhon."

---

[132] *State Socialism* (1911 ed.), 30.

[133] Ishill (ed.), *Free Vistas,* II, 300-301. Tucker hated the linotype machine, and it is believed that he never rode in an automobile in his life. For recent literature on this theme see especially Friedrich Juenger, *The Failure of Technology* (Hinsdale, Ill., 1949).

[134] Tucker's letter to Labadie, in which he expressed the nature of his support, is not known to be in existence. As reprinted in *Instead of a Magazine,* II (September 15, 1915), 22-23, it read:

On the world scene of the mid-1930s, Tucker's views were unequivocal. "Capitalism is at least tolerable, which cannot be said of Socialism or Communism," he declared, going on to observe that "Under any of these regimes a sufficiently shrewd man can feather his nest." On another occasion he conceded, "Yes, I think the world is hell-bent"; "War is certainly to come, but how soon I do not know." "I hate the age in which I live, but do not hate myself for living in it," he remarked still later, "But there is fun in fighting"; "It is not necessary to hope in order to persevere."

Of the anarchist papers, he thought *Mother Earth* the best; "It has unique and interesting things, and commands the respect of intelligent and honest people." But he was sure that its influence was very limited." On the subject of anarchism he was unrelenting. He conceded that there were anarchists "in all countries," but would not venture a guess as

---

"Bool says you wish to know my reasons for favoring the Allies. I favor the Allies *because I love the French people,* because I pity the Belgian people, because I admire the British influences that make for liberty; because I feel some (tho [sic] I regret to say decreasing) concern for the future of the American people; because I have a considerable sympathy for the people of Russia, and because I hate and fear the German people as a nation of domineering brutes, bent on turning the world into a police-ridden paradise of the Prussian pattern. . . ." Stress is the author's. For a partial reprint of this letter minus the all-important reference to the French see Charles A. Madison, *Critics and Crusaders,* 211.

For an earlier communication by Tucker, hoping for the destruction of Germany and speculating on an American entry, see *The Spectator,* January 30, 1915, pp. 152-153. Max Eastman misunderstood Tucker's support of the Allies as satire. *The Masses,* IX (June, 1917), 28-29; (September, 1917), 9.

[135] This letter was reprinted in *Ego,* (January, 1923), 7-8.

[136] For Tucker's support of Vanzetti see New Bedford *Standard,* May 22, 1927.

to their total number. But he scouted Baskette's question about anarchist communism; "The term Communist Anarchist has no sense." "What I call the Anarchist Movement is near the vanishing point," he concluded, and added some very critical words on the situation in Spain, already on the verge of its great upheaval of 1936-1939. " 'Anarchism' in Spain is a misnomer," Tucker chided Baskette for asking the question. "In Proudhon's day his influence in Spain was considerable, and his adherents were intelligent. Spanish anarchists of today, with perhaps a few exceptions of little significance, are a crazy bunch."

Benjamin R. Tucker died at his home in Monaco on June 22, 1939 in his eighty-sixth year, survived by his wife and daughter. His burial, following a civil, private service, "without mourning, according to his express wish," took place two days later. The cataclysm of the Second World War was barely more than two months away, and in the following decade and a half, interest in and knowledge of the tradition which Tucker represented faded to an all time low. It was a rare person whose personal acquaintance went back to Tucker's time who managed to live into the mid-1950s and witness the revival of interest in the literature and ideas of American individualist anarchism.[137]

A study of anarchism, especially since the end of *Liberty* and the almost simultaneous rise of Emma Goldman and *Mother Earth,* the new voice of anarchist communism, is probably best conceived as belonging in a study of the whole radical movement of the twentieth century. Today an anarchist press exists in the United States, Canada, Mexico, Argentina, Australia, China, Japan and India, as well as in every country in western Europe. Its growth as an underground movement in Germany, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Russia is a well-known fact. It is naïve to believe that the two great wars of our century have succeeded in extinguishing the belief in a stateless system. An unmeasurable influence of anarchism is the presence of much of its libertarian flavor in numerous organizations the world around, which have not openly expressed opposition to the state as such. Although forced into assuming a degree of caution which it previously rarely needed, anarchism and its close industrial relation, syndicalism, remain intellectual forces of considerable strength, and capable of surprising vigor in situations characterized by political vacuum, as the activity in Barcelona and Catalonia demonstrated so dramatically during the recent Spanish Civil War.

---

137. Tucker to Baskette, August 21, December 29, 1933; June 16, November 7, November 19, December 26, 1934; March 28, 1935. Baskette Collection. The only American of note spoken well of by Tucker was Roger Baldwin. "You were favored in being able to see and hear Roger Baldwin," he wrote in his last letter to Baskette; "unfortunately I have never had that privilege." This writer possesses one of the formal printed notices announcing the death and funeral services of Tucker in Monaco.

The catastrophe of war has been a strong impetus in arousing interest in the arguments of anarchism, especially in defeated countries and in areas of great destruction. This interest has extended from the calculated individual escapism of the Henry David Thoreau type to the scientific communal village preached for well over a generation by Peter Kropotkin. A moribund or dead philosophy is not capable of producing the astonishing volume of literature that has poured from the world anarchist press since 1920.

Twentieth century political tendencies have been expressed predominantly in collectivism of one variety or another, especially in their practical aspects. Current trends continue decidedly in this direction, despite widespread apprehension concerning the consequences of the submergence of the individual personality. On the other hand, the repeated failure of national states to solve either internal or external problems to any large measure of satisfaction has been accompanied by a chorus of anarchist criticism, expressing belief that human society will never be orderly so long as the state is the institution through which man seeks to develop his abilities and capacities for social living.

In the United States and western Europe, anarchist thought appears under three other forms: (1) as an intellectual distillate, found principally among the *avant garde* of literature, philosophy and art; (2) as an expression of the syndicalist movement, which continues to support a vigorous English and foreign language press; (3) as a reflection of many small libertarian groups ranging from experimental educators to exponents of social decentralization. Their numbers include a sizeable body of intellectuals grown tired of politics and frightened of the potentialities of the state as a machine of destruction, in an age of automatic weapons and highly-specialized scientific war *materiel.* Many of these are pacifists, already shocked by the conduct of total war. Still another anti-statist reflection can be detected among a sensitive minority without positive stands of any particular kind, but anxiously seeking to escape the elements of the state of our time as expressed by industrialization, urbanization and cultural typing. Past mid-century the world tends toward the authoritarianism of Marxian politics and away from the individualistic and mutualistic conceptions of society embodied in the ideals taught by Warren, Tucker, Bakunin and Kropotkin. Nevertheless the anarchists remain unimpressed by the world which authority is engaged in forging, in which the outstanding characteristic of human life appears to be its increasing insecurity. The telling effect of anarchist criticism, although largely negative, upon critics of the present world order such as Gaetano Mosca and Robert Michels and many others cannot be ignored, nor have these writers attempted to refute most of such charges.[138] Yet despite the piercing insights which anarchism has provided as means of observing evidences of decay and viciousness in political and economic systems of all kinds, it has itself been subject to the same deteriorating effects in attempts of a practical nature at realizing its goals. Nowhere is there evidence that the leadership principle and the struggle for power within groups of whatever origin are becoming obsolete.[139]

---

[138] Mosca, *Ruling Classes,* 286; Robert Michels, *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy* (New York, 1915), 357-358.

---

139. See especially on this subject James Burnham, *The Machiavellians: Defenders of Freedom* (New York, 1943), and the depressing analysis by Max Nomad in the introduction to his *Apostles of Revolution*, 3-11. Nomad's observation that the leaders and followers alike of radical movements are prone to quickly swing to various versions of reaction is later developed with extremely damaging corroborative evidence. A supplementary work of singular significance is Eric Hoffer, *The True Believer; Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements* (New York, 1951).

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

No full-scale study of the scope and significance of anarchistic writings and teachings in the United States has ever been undertaken by an American.[1] The bulk of American references to anarchists and anarchism have been confined to three principal sources: (1) emotional polemics and frankly sensational accounts;[2] (2) English translations of the works of German, French, and Italian writers, of varying merit; (3) the writings of anarchists themselves, either in the form of original source materials of wide circulation or books and articles of semi-objective nature. In view of this situation, it is not strange that in the main, the contributions of the American-born have either been almost wholly neglected, or have been attached to the tail of the European comet. With the exception of the works of Max Nettlau, comprehensive studies usually date from the first decade of the present century. These continue to be used almost exclusively, a situation partially due to the relative inactivity of the present day anarchist press, especially in the United States.

Little definitive work either by American writers or doing justice to Americans involved in anarchist groups is to be found in encyclopedias[3]

---

1. A brief account in this direction is contained in Eunice Minette Schuster, "Native American Anarchism," in Smith College *Studies in History,* XVII (October 1931—July 1932), 118-187. Tucker thought the Schuster study "very interesting," containing "much information as well as many errors." Tucker to Baskette, December 28, 1934, Baskette Collection. A summary of individual anarchist thought has appeared in a general account dealing with libertarian notables in the United States by Rudolf Rocker, *Pioneers of American Freedom* (Los Angeles, 1949).
2. Journalistic and flippant accounts of various phases of American social history, during which anarchist activity has been noted, exist in part of a number of secular volumes. For instance see Grace Adams and Edward Hutter, *The Mad Forties* (New York, 1942); Heywood Broun and Margaret Leech, *Anthony Comstock, Roundsman of the Lord* (New York, 1927); Emanie Louise Sachs, *"The Terrible Siren," Victoria Woodhull (1838-1927)* (New York, 1928); Lillian Symes and Travers Clement, *Rebel America; The Story of Social Revolt in the United States* (New York, 1934).
3. One instance of the bankruptcy of objective scholarship with reference to the study of anarchism is pointed up by the fact that the current (1947) edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* continues to use the article written by the communist anarchist Peter Kropotkin which appeared in the eleventh (1910) edition, to which is appended an undistinguished addition by the late Harold J. Laski. Kropotkin placed little emphasis on the importance of American contributions to the belief in the social order without government. Kropotkin's bibliography remains valuable in part. The article "Anarchism" by Oscar Jaszi in the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (15 vols. New York, 1930-1935), I, 46-53, remains too filled with conjecture to be of more than cursory interest to students seeking a knowledge of the scope of American participation in the development of anarchist thought.

or in bibliographies of radical literature. The two outstanding students of anarchist bibliography, both of whose works are over forty years old, remain practically unused and uncited . The three volume compilation by the German Josef Stammhammer, *Bibliographie des Socialismus und Communismus,*[4] contains the most comprehensive and systematic study of anarchist writings for the period before 1909. Ignored by students of anarchist thought because of its misleading title, it remains of great value, especially with regard to the contributions of the native Americans.

The only other work of merit in the field of bibliographical material is the one volume by Max Nettlau, *Bibliographie de L'Anarchie.*[5] It is based in part on the first volume of Stammhammer but contains many items unlisted by the latter. Not only is Nettlau superior from the point of view of arrangement, in that only anarchist writings are listed, but additional helps have been provided through his effort to classify the authors according to country of origin and particular "school" of no-government thought.[6] Later compilations have been fragmentary, incomplete, and disappointingly brief.[7]

European scholarship has been dominant not only in bibliographies but also in the field of general works. Inspired by the wave of assassinations and associated terroristic acts of the '80's and '90's, a torrent of books poured from the presses of western Europe, most of them ephemeral in nature, superficial in treatment, and generally embodying a violent and abusive approach. Few if any showed an acquaintance with anarchist literature,[8] and the tendency to arraign all anarchists as criminals was widespread. Early observers, such as Augustin Frederic Hamon and the Italian criminologist Césare Lombroso, investigated this direct action with particular attention to its alleged criminal and psychopathic implications.[9]

---

[4] Jena, 1893-1909.

[5] Published in Brussels in 1897, but completed in England the year before. Nettlau has contributed valuable additions to bibliography in his excellent short book *Esbozo de Historia de las Utopias* (Buenos Aires, 1934).

[6] Nettlau is without doubt the most prolific of the writers on anarchism. He has written original works in four languages, as well as editing significant collections of anarchist material of documentary nature. See *Michael Bakunin Gesammelte Werke* (3 vols. Berlin, 1921-1924).

Of considerable value from an internal viewpoint in understanding anarchism is the four volume *L'Encyclopédie Anarchiste,* edited by Sebastien Faure (Paris, n.d.).

[7] Some anarchist entries are contained in the following: Frederick B. Adams, Jr., *Radical Literature in America* (Stamford, Conn., 1939); Rena Reese, *List of Books and Pamphlets in a Special Collection in the Library of the Workingmen's Institute, New Harmony, Ind.* (New Harmony, Ind., 1909); Savel Zimand, *Modern Social Movements; Descriptive Summaries and Bibliographies* (New York, 1921). Some entries of interest to researchers in anarchist literature are to be found in Harold Lasswell, Ralph D. Casey, and Bruce Smith, *Propaganda and Promotional Activities* (Minneapolis, 1935). For a partial list of anarchist literature but valuable also as an indicator of allied sentiments found in contemporary poetry, drama and fiction, see *B. R. Tucker's Unique Catalog of Advanced Literature* (New York, 1906).

[8] See the statement by Zenker on this matter in *Anarchism,* 49.

The first study of a general nature which showed an understanding of the scope of the source material of anarchism was the work of the German critic Ernst Victor Zenker, *Der Anarchismus, Kritische Geschichte der Anarchistische Theorie,* which appeared in 1895.[10] Although not sympathetic with the aims of the exponents of total abolition of the state, Zenker upbraided contemporaries for their failure to read the works of Proudhon and others before rushing into print. He recognized that there existed a cleavage between the European and American anarchist philosophies, even though he was unable to clearly state the principal differences. Zenker did deplore, however, the facile generalizations which placed all the protagonists of anarchism in the camp of the supporters of "propaganda by action." He observed, as did Lombroso and others, that the beginning of nearly all violent revolutions found criminals and other disreputable elements taking part, thus making worthy of examinations even the profession of anarchism on the part of participators in violence.[11]

Zenker's effort was followed by that of another German, the judge Dr. Paul Eltzbacher, whose *Der Anarchismus* (Berlin, 1900)[12] was a trail-breaking historical analysis of anarchist ideology. It is noteworthy from the American point of view in that he selected the New England-born Benjamin R. Tucker as the most succinct and comprehensive expositor of individualist anarchism. Eltzbacher, despite the meticulous scrutiny which he brought to the materials he used, gave no indication of knowledge of the bibliographical researches of Nettlau, nor an awareness of the vitality of Tucker's associates or predecessors, or the eclectic character of his ideas.

The only general account of anarchism by an objective observer which demonstrates a thorough mastery of the voluminous source material related to the subject remains that of the careful Italian scholar Ettore Zoccoli, *L'Anarchia.*[13] Unfortunately, it has never appeared in an English

---

[9] See note 4. Hamon's *Psychologie de l'Anarchiste-Socialiste* (Paris, 1895) should be used with caution. The greater part of Lombroso has been vitiated by recent research as well.

[10] Published originally in Jena, an English translation two years later had wide circulation. All citations are from this later edition.

[11] Zenker, *Anarchism,* 6, 211-241; Ernest C. F. Babelon, *Encyclopedia Britannica,* XI ed., I, 916-917, note.

[12] A French edition appeared in Paris in 1902, but no English translation was available until that of Steven T. Byington was published by Tucker (New York, 1908).

[13] Originally published in Turin in 1907, another Italian edition was published as recently as 1944 in Milan. A German translation of the first edition was available in Leipzig and Amsterdam in 1908 as *Die Anarchie. Ihre Verkünden. Ihre Ideen. Ihre Taten.*

In this volume Zoccoli dismissed Eltzbacher as a serious student of anarchism from the point of view of comprehension of source materials. He was unable to understand the latter's failure to know of Nettlau's exhaustive translation. Documented in four languages, Zoccoli's formidable survey lists many additional anarchist writings mentioned in no other work before his time, and constitutes a valuable addition to the bibliography available to investigators. The reason for its obscurity remains unexplained. Like the essays of other Europeans, unfortunately his treatment of the Americans was weak, due mainly to the unavailability of most of their publications in overseas libraries.

With the success of fascist and communist regimes in Italy and Russia, the study of anarchism shifted to northwestern Europe. Germany became the center of a vigorous anarchist press for more than a decade. The process of going underground was repeated here after the emergence of the authoritarian National Socialist government in 1933. Highly centralized states have generally conducted intensive repression of anarchist writing and propaganda, regardless of their orientation.

If Max Nettlau had established himself as a prominent figure in anarchist bibliography, he was to become even more prominent as the historian of anarchism during the period 1925-35. By 1931 he had published a three volume account of its development from early beginnings to 1886.[14] Four years later he rounded out his survey of the entire field in a fourth volume, *La Anarquia a través de los Tiempos* (Barcelona, 1935).

Nettlau's interest in the subject was no ephemeral fancy. No other person has approached his almost fifty years of persistent scholarship in this particular field.[15] Although sympathetic to the doctrines of Kropotkin and Bakunin, he devoted some part of his work to a consideration of the influence of the Americans in the delineation of world anarchist thought. The absence of non-partisan diligence equal to that displayed by Nettlau has established his productions as the definitive treatment of the subject to this time, despite the fact that his last two volumes remain almost unknown in the United States. Numerous other studies by various French, German and Russian observers, of varying merit, have appeared over a

---

bibliographical work, nor why he referred to a sixteen page pamphlet as the only work "based on a comprehensive knowledge of the sources." *L'Anarchia,* introd., xxii; Eltzbacher, *Anarchism,* (1908 English transl.), 5. For the work of another Italian scholar in this field, see E. Sernicoli, *L'Anarchia e gli Anarchici; Studio Storico e Politico* (2 vols. Milan, 1894).

[14] *Der Forfrühling der Anarchie, Ihre Historische Entwicklung den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 1864* (Berlin, 1925); *Der Anarchismus von Proudhon zu Kropotkin; Seine Historische Entwicklung in den Jahre 1859-1880* (Berlin, 1927; *Anarchisten und Sozial-Revolutionäre; die Historische Entwicklung des Anarchismus in den Jahren 1880-1886* (Berlin, 1931).

[15] Nettlau died in Amsterdam July 23, 1944. He lived in retirement, unmolested by the Nazis, although his anarchist writings were part of the literature proscribed by the Hitler regime. For details of his last days, see Nettlau MSS, Labadie Collection, General Library, University of Michigan, Annie Adama van Scheltema to Agnes Inglis, November 2, 1946. The former is the librarian of the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

fifty year period but few contain anything of value to the student of American anarchism in its individualist manifestations.[16]

It is significant that the first person to deem the study of anarchism in the United States worthy of a separate examination was a French student of economic and social history, Paul Ghio, later a professor of political economy at the University of Brussels. His *L'Anarchisme aux Etats-Unis* is valuable less for its presentation of American anarchism and its sources than for its examination of American industrial conditions as a force productive of unrest.[17] Ghio's knowledge of American anarchist progenitors was of the most rudimentary kind. Moreover, his personal acquaintance[18] with the then current prominent anti-state protagonists in the United States served to distort his perspective. This was particularly true with respect to the origins of American mutualism and individualism then receiving considerable attention in the radical press. In the main, however, Ghio's account is hardly more than an introduction to the subject.[19]

Other European students of radicalism had shown some interest in the purely American aspects of anarchist activity before the time of Ghio's introductory study; yet, extensive investigations of the whole field remained unattempted. Zoccoli, undertaking an examination of the revived interest among the American individualists in the vigorously egoistic writing of Max Stirner,[20] the first large-scale survey of a particular part of anti-statist thought in the United States, was the lone exception. Like his later comprehensive critique, his *I Gruppi Anarchici degli Stati Uniti e L'Opera di Max Stirner* remains practically unknown.[21]

---

[16] Rudolf Stammler, *Die Theorie des Anarchismus* (Berlin, 1894); Georgii Valentinovich Plekhanov, *Anarchism and Socialism* (Chicago, 1908), a socialist critique; Felix Dubois, *Le Péril Anarchiste* (Paris, 1894); Alfred Naquet, *L'Anarchie et le Collectivisme* (Paris, 1904); Gustave de Lamarzelle, *L'Anarchie dans le Monde Moderne* (Paris, 1919). For others consult Nettlau, *Bibliographie,* 211-243; same author, *Esbozo,* 7; Zoccoli, *L'Anarchia,* introd., xvii-xxix.

[17] Ghio, *L'Anarchisme,* 21-55; same author, *La Formation Historique de L'Économie Politique* (Paris, 1923), 163.

[18] Ghio became acquainted with Tucker in New York. See his description of Tucker in *L'Anarchisme,* 80-81, 101-103.

Ghio later sent Tucker a copy of his book from Paris, including a warm note of appreciation on the fly-leaf. This particular volume was loaned to the writer for examination by the late Pearl Johnson Tucker.

[19] Nettlau went much further than Ghio in his delineation of American anarchist activity, although he never considered the individualist variety worthy of separate consideration in an extended work.

[20] The pseudonym of Johann Caspar Schmidt (1806-1856), whose *Der Einzige und sein Eigentum* (Leipzig, 1845), is doubtless the most vigorous statement of individualism in Western literature. Translated by Byington, as was Eltzbacher's book, and published by Tucker (New York, 1907), under the title *The Ego and His Own,* it had a profound influence on many of the group. There is a revived interest in Stirner in post-war Europe. A French translation by Henri Lasvignes, *L'Unique et Sa Proprieté,* appeared in Paris in 1948, while Zoccoli's study of Stirner was reprinted in Italy in 1944.

[21] Modena, 1901. For recent scholarship on the relations between American

Despite pioneer research of this type there remained a large twilight zone penetrated by no more than two or three scholars until well into the twentieth century. Included under this head were the anarchist and allied equitist communities of the period from 1830 to 1870, already a lost episode in American history. This was hardly due to neglect on the part of those outside the movement. Much of it was due to the uncommunicativeness of the participants, seeking to avoid the attention of sensationalist newspapers and a scandal-loving public. Another prominent reason was the paucity of literature concerning the functioning of these unique settlements, which contained few of the literati commonly associated with the various contemporary Fourierist colonies.[22] Early historians were not able, therefore, to properly estimate the significance of native anti-statism in American history, and little written since their original efforts varies from the conclusions first arrived at. The works of Richard T. Ely,[23] Herbert L. Osgood,[24] Charles Edward Merriam,[25] when supplemented by the more exhaustive researches of the group of investigators headed by John R. Commons[26] and the previously mentioned contributions of Nettlau, constitute practically the whole body of secondary materials on the subject.[27]

---

anarchists, Stirner, and Stirner's biographer, John Henry Mackay, see Thomas A. Riley, "New England Anarchism in Germany," in *New England Quarterly,* XVIII (March, 1945), 25-38; same author, "Anti-Statism in German Literature," in Modern Language Association of America *Publications,* LXII (September, 1947), 828-843.

[22] Josiah Warren was so apprehensive of publicity that he refused to state the location of the Ohio colony at Clermont, near Cincinnati, in his own publications. Eight and a half years after its founding he saw fit to remark, "Equity demands that every one have the disposal of his or her time, and the choice of their visitors and associates, but public notoriety to this place and the people would render both impossible. . . . I do not feel free to give publicity at present, to the name or locality of this place; but each citizen can invite such friends to his own house as he may see fit." *The Periodical Letter on the Principles and Progress of the "Equity Movement,"* II (March, 1856), 46-47.

[23] *The Labor Movement in America* (New York, 1886).

[24] "Scientific Anarchism," in *Political Science Quarterly,* IV (March, 1889), 1-36.

[25] The Merriam thesis applying to anarchism in the United States described in the introduction can be found in a number of his representative works; see for example his *A History of American Political Theories* (New York, 1903); *American Political Theories* (New York, 1920); *American Political Ideas; Studies in the Development of American Political Thought 1865-1917* (New York, 1920), and also Paul H. Douglas, "Proletarian Political Theory," in Charles Edward Merriam and Harry Elmer Barnes, eds., *History of Political Theories* (New York, 1924), 197-200.

[26] *History of Labor in the United States* (4 vols. New York, 1918-1935).

[27] Schuster, "Native American Anarchism," in Smith College *Studies in History,* cited above, draws heavily upon these authorities with respect to theory and documentation. Supplemented by original research, it remains, despite several errors, the only work of merit by an American on native anarchism.

The attempt to see anarchist thought in seventeenth century religious unorthodoxy is unsound. Anarchism, categorically rejecting arbitrary authority, is by nature an atheistic doctrine. For another theory of the origins of

Biographical work of definitive quality on any of the nearly fifty individual anarchists whose published works appeared during the period 1825-1925 has yet to be done. William Bailie's uncritical *Josiah Warren, The First American Anarchist,*[28] remains the only full scale attempt of this kind. It is marred by eulogistic treatment and use of too few source materials.[29] Recent essays of biographical nature dealing with two other prominent men in the movement have also appeared,[30] but in the larger sense this group of radicals has received little attention.

Labor historians have been aware of the existence and contributions of Warren and his associates in the field of radical economic reform proposals and experiments for some time, but rarely from a first-hand examination of his writings.[31] John R. Commons has no doubt conducted the closest study of the influence of the ideas of the New England-born dissidents upon the American labor movement from the time of Andrew Jackson down to the end of Reconstruction. The results of his evaluations and those of his co-workers in the valuable *History of Labor in the United States*[32] are useful but incomplete.

---

anarchism as understood by modern standards, see Gaetano Mosca, *The Ruling Class,* 271-273. Mosca sees anarchist and socialist thought and reform movements as developments from eighteenth and nineteenth century rationalism, not from any recognized religious emanations.

28. Boston, 1906. See also Dorothy W. Douglas, article "Josiah Warren," in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* XV, 364-365, based heavily upon Bailie.

29. It remains virtually unrecognized that this book is the product of the research of an anarchist. Bailie, one of the group of literary philosophical egoists who made *Liberty* the best-known anarchist periodical in the English language at the turn of the century, was a pamphleteer of considerable merit in the cause. For example, see his essay, "The Anarchist Spirit," the introduction to his brief study of Warren's life, *Josiah Warren,* xi-xxxviii.

Bailie is also the author of the chapter dealing with Warren in George Browning Lockwood, *The New Harmony Movement* (Marion, Ind., 1902), an accomplishment which he is almost never credited with.

30. Harvey Wish, "Stephen Pearl Andrews, American Pioneer Sociologist," in *Social Forces,* XIX (May, 1941), 477-482; Charles A. Madison, "Benjamin R. Tucker; Individualist and Anarchist," in *New England Quarterly,* XVI (September, 1943), 444-467.

31. Minor treatments occur in Mary Ritter Beard, *A Short History of the American Labor Movement* (New York, 1928), and Selig Perlman, *A History of Trade Unionism in the United States* (New York, 1923).

32. John R. Commons, Introduction, I, 14-21; David J. Saposs, "Colonial and Federal Beginnings to 1827," I, 95-99; Henry E. Hoagland, "Humanitarianism (1840-1860)," I, 494-556; John B. Andrews, "Nationalism (1860-1877)," II, 126-138; Selig Perlman, "Upheaval and Reorganization (Since 1876)," II, 204, 210.

The pre-occupation of most native political scientists with the externals of practical politics has caused them, as a rule, to ignore the growth of anarchist doctrines which have been the product of conditions distinctively American. The most able and original among a number of brief considerations are those of Charles Edward Merriam previously noted, and Raymond G. Gettell, *History of American Political Thought* (New York, 1928), 584-586.

The evaluation of anarchist beliefs from a political point of view results in the interpretation of paucity of numbers and political impotence as direct

Observation of anarchism in the United States by students of and spokesmen for other segments of the radical movement has often been less objective than that of the more orthodox and conventional. The socialist Morris Hillquit offers an opportunity for scrutiny on this point. In his *History of Socialism in the United States,*[33] Hillquit, as did the majority of his contemporaries, exaggerated the importance of Johann Most. The ideals and objectives of Most and the Germans for whom he was the spokesman have been uncritically accepted as those for which all American anarchists stood. It was as plain then as now, however, that Most could reach a limited audience at best, since he was limited to his native tongue in directly communicating ideas. The prominence of the Germans in the Haymarket affair tended to cloud over other considerations, and Hillquit, in a similar manner to the non-radical critics, participated in accepting and promoting this generalization. Anarchist membership and thought beyond the narrow scope of the struggle for power in the labor movement was something which he considered hardly worth a cursory glance. Heavy reliance on John Humphrey Noyes' *History of American Socialisms* for the beginnings of the non-political socialist communities had acquainted him with Robert Owen, the early group of equitists, and their labor exchange ideas. But Warren, the later group of mutualists and Tuckerite school of anarchist intellectuals were completely ignored.[34] American individualist anarchism has received little sympathy or consideration from advocates of collectivism.[35]

---

evidence of inferiority. This approach, along with the charge of visionary intellectualism, constitute the methods of which such un-ordinary thinking is consigned to obscurity. No satisfactory method has yet been employed to correctly determine the worth of the propositions which constitute what Herbert Read calls "the politics of the unpolitical."

[33] New York, 1906.

[34] Hillquit, *History of Socialism*, 230-252. The probable reason may have been the assumption that the individualist and Fourierite communities had an identical mode of operation. Harry W. Laidler, *A History of Socialist Thought* (New York, 1927), contains no development of anarchism in the United States, but does present a fair evaluation of the difference between anarchism and socialism. Of special value with reference to anarchist bibliography in works devoted primarily to socialism is Donald D. Egbert and Stow Persons, *Socialism and American Life* (2 vols. Princeton, 1952), II. This includes mention of a considerable number of standard works applying to anarchism in the United States, but includes no significant additions not mentioned in Stammhammer and Nettlau, and suffers from the lack of inclusion of the numerous small periodicals of the anarchist press.

Anarchism was by no means ignored by the socialists, however. A vast amount of criticism can be observed in the press of the socialist groups after 1880 in particular, with Laurance Gronlund and the Christian Socialist William D. P. Bliss prominent among the critics.

[35] Albert Weisbord, Communist labor leader of the 1920's, saw little difference between the advocacy of Warren's principles and the arrangements existing in the conventional capitalist economy. See his extensive *Conquest of Power* (2 vols. New York, 1937), I, 225-236. This was substantially the verdict of Marx in condemning the teachings of Proudhon, Warren's French contemporary, as the outlook of the "petty bourgeois." A current sympa-

Cultural and industrial integration have proceeded together in the United States. One of the principal non-material results has been a growing standardization of thought. This has been fostered by the centralized flow of information and communication, promoting an uniformity of response which has steadily grown more and more hostile to nonconformism. The end product has been, in time of stress, a tendency to widespread hysteria, followed by castigation and persecution of all deviates. This blanket apprehension of divergence has an uncritical character which has had curious and lamentable implications.[36] It is certain, nevertheless, that despite the tendency to accept the tastes and judgments of the majority without challenge as to evidence of superiority,[37] an examination of American radicalism from other vantage points than that of purely external effect is worthy of effort. Most writers have taken this latter approach toward the less sensational phases of the radical movement, one of these being the origins and development of native American anarchist thought.[38]

---

thetic survey incorporating this approach is Jacob Salwyn Schapiro, "Pierre Joseph Proudhon, Harbinger of Fascism," in *American Historical Review,* L (July, 1945), 714-737, and the same author's *Liberalism and the Challenge of Fascism* (New York, 1949), 332-369. See as well the severely critical review of Schapiro's article by Nicola Chiaromonte, "P. J. Proudhon an Uncomfortable Thinker," in *Politics,* III (January, 1946), 27-29, and the unfavorable evaluation of the Schapiro thesis by Philip Taft, *Movements for Economic Reform* (New York, 1950), 109. An early defense of Proudhon against such charges is Arthur Mülberger, "Karl Marx, Das Elend der Philosophie," in *Jahrbücher für Nationalokönomie und Statistik,* LIX (Jena, 1892), 536-545. This article was translated by George Schumm and published under the title "Marx vs. Proudhon," in *Liberty,* IX (April 29, 1893), 1-3. Anarchist circles have tended to regard Marxism in its political manifestations as deeply reactionary, including in this matter the *Communist Manifesto* itself. Of considerable interest relating to this is G. P. Maximov, *The Guillotine at Work, Twenty Years of Terror in Russia* (Chicago, 1940), 19-20.

[36] The deportations of anarchists to Soviet Russia, where hostility to their doctrines was even more extreme than in the United States, is one incident that stands out. For their subsequent mistreatment, imprisonment and execution see André Gide, *Communist and Co-Operative Colonies* (New York, 1928), 155-157, the previously cited work of Maximov, and the celebrated autobiography of Emma Goldman, *Living My Life* (2 vols. New York, 1931). For other aspects of this matter as dealt with by generally ignored anarchist writers, consult Emma Goldman, *My Disillusionment in Russia* (New York, 1923); same author, *My Further Disillusionment in Russia* (New York, 1924); Alexander Berkman, *The Bolshevik Myth* (New York, 1925); and the voluminous *La Revolution Inconnue (1917-1921), Documentation Inedité sur la Revolution Russe* (Paris, 1947). This was written by Vsevolod Mikhailovitch Eichenbaum, better known as Voline in anarchist circles, and published through the efforts of his friends after his death in 1945. (Now in English translation; 2 vols., New York, 1954-55).

[37] For a provocative discussion of ochlocratic tendencies in aspects of majority rule. despite its aristocratic bias, see Francis Stuart Campbell, *The Menace of the Herd* (Milwaukee, 1943).

[38] Ralph H. Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought* (New York, 1940); Merle Curti, *The Growth of American Thought* (New York, 1943); Herbert W. Schneider, *A History of American Philosophy* (New York,

1946), contain faint references to the presence of native anarchist tendencies. The highly regarded work of Alice Felt Tyler, *Freedom's Ferment, Phases of American Social History to 1860,* omits accounts of the anarchist colonies in Ohio and New York. The numerous publications of New England anarchists find no mention in major studies by Vernon Lewis Parrington and Van Wyck Brooks, although the highly original character of the early efforts of Warren and Spooner has been observed by Edwin R. A. Seligman; see "Economists," *The Cambridge History of American Literature* (3 vols. New York, 1921), III, 437. A partial survey of the economic propositions of the American anarchists can be found in Joseph Dorfman, *The Economic Mind in American Civilization* (3 vols. New York, 1946-1949), II, 671-678. The bibliography of books concerned with American political theory or with the social, economic or intellectual history of the United States which fail to deal with anarchism is impressive.

The place and date of publication of most recent editions of individualist anarchist books have been noted in either the bibliography or in appropriate notes in this edition; the stepped-up interest in these works is especially noticeable in the 1960s.

Of recent works not mentioned elsewhere but of substantial bibliographical merit is Leonard Krimerman and Lewis Perry (eds.), *Patterns of Anarchy* (New York, 1966).

The London journals *Anarchy* (1961-) and *Minus One* (1961-) and of course the London weekly *Freedom* are exceptional for bibliographical assistance for the most recent decade. A file of such journals as *Individual Action* and *The Struggle* would be extremely useful for the years following the first edition of this book.

The most substantial bibliographical help undoubtedly would be the *Bulletins* of the Centre International de Recherches sur l'Anarchisme, located in Geneva, Switzerland.

APPENDIX I

Foreword to the First (1953) Edition
By Harry Elmer Barnes

Dr. Martin has made a commendable contribution to American intellectual and social history. American anarchistic thought is an important segment of this aspect of our past. It has been generally neglected, and, when dealt with at all, has more often than not been misunderstood, deliberately distorted, or both. His book is essentially the biography of a social idea pieced together from the lives and thoughts of the men whose individual contributions made it a fully developed and consistent outlook upon life.

The history of ideas tends to concentrate upon and feature those which have been adopted or accepted by the majority or by those in authority. The pragmatic test tends to weed out those which are rejected by the masses or are unpopular with the dominant intellectual classes. The thinking of many minority groups, whatever its intrinsic merit, is still lightly documented and much neglected. As successive established orders and varieties of the *status quo* pile upon one another, the literary by-product is the relegation of fringe thinkers to obscurity or abuse. In popular terminology we regularly run across the epithets "crackpot" and "crank" applied to thinkers whose ideas are generally considered too extreme, unworkable or impractical from some current frame of reference. Descriptions such as these have an overtone of demolition, implied or consciously wished, which is often so summary that persons and ideas thus designated tend to undergo dismissal without a scrap of serious contemporary consideration. Dr. Martin's study is a calculated experiment of a different nature. He does not take the interpretative approach from the vantage point of the contemporary value system, with its often obvious conclusion. The record is stated with a minimum of attempt to produce findings sympathetic with a preconceived reader audience, one of the common failings in the preparation of monographs dealing with intellectual history.

Textbook writers and others whose historical labors are confined to surveys of American history on the grand scale, whose narratives con-

---

[The eminent scholar Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes died on August 25, 1968 in his eightieth year. A superlative account of his career will be found in the symposium *Harry Elmer Barnes, Learned Crusader: The New History in Action* (Colorado Springs: Ralph Myles Publisher, 1968).]

centrate on the broad sweep of conventional political events or the epics of military conflicts, are more and more prone to brush aside the contributions of the unconventional or the radical elements in society, except in such cases as they happen to disturb the tranquility of the existing order by violent demonstration. The all too usual fate of deviant thinkers whose lives are also characterized by a lack of sensational gestures is rapid obscurity.

The changing fashions of radical thought flit across the world scene in such a way that it is relatively easy for any particular one to drop from sight. In the process, the material contributions and literary achievements of many minority ideologies often sink below the surface of everyday life, unless they reach popularity at another time when espoused by more respectable circles. One of the chief tasks of the intellectual historian is to restore the outlines of these experiments, so that they can obtain proper consideration and evaluation. This is what Dr. Martin undertakes in this study, in which he seeks to document fully the development of an interesting phase of native radicalism customarily described as individualist anarchism.

This type of thought is one of the unique episodes in the intellectual and social history of the Western World in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but until Dr. Martin's researches it has only been partially put in the historical record. His book is the first full-length study of the individualistic anarchist movement. No other student has so thoroughly examined the obscure source-materials or incorporated them so completely in a scholarly production. It disposes of the persistent illusion that radical thought is mostly an evil alien graft upon the wholesome tree of American life, secretly spirited into this country by dubious persons outside the pale of Anglo-Saxon culture. It further undermines the comfortable delusion that radical thought in this country has been the product of a handful of "maladjusted" persons, the mentally ill, the unsuccessful, inconsequential minds, those nursing imaginary grievances, and the generally frustrated periphery of the social system.

Dr. Martin has not only restored for us a full knowledge and detailed picture of native American anarchist thought but has also given his subject more precision than has earlier prevailed, and has successfully brushed away the smears heaped upon it by contemporary popular prejudice. He shows clearly that the mere fact of resentment against established authority, religious, political or economic, cannot always be properly described as true anarchist philosophy and tradition. Many statements and policies frequently listed as of anarchist vintage are, in reality, closer to the various forms of imposed collectivism which anarchism repudiates. This is as true for many of the early "utopian" programs as it is for the current nostrums masquerading behind the fiction of collective ownership.

In his book, Dr. Martin also fully exposes the unfairness and distortion visited upon the American anarchist movement as a result of the violence of foreign intruders, and occasional quasi-criminals, exemplified by the Haymarket Affair in Chicago in 1886, Alexander Berkman's attempt on the life of Henry C. Frick, and the assassination of President McKinley by Leon Czolgosz.* Native American anarchist thinkers indignantly disavowed the technique of violence, but the smears took hold and still stick, and students of American intellectual history are still reluctant in straightening out the record.

As Dr. Martin makes clear, native American individualist anarchism had a fairly consistent philosophy. This embodied intellectual and social opposition to formal political authority, abrupt refusal to coöperate with such authority in bringing about reforms in the social order, and advocacy of the substitution of a non-coercive, voluntary coöperative society for the present social organization. There was rarely any effort made to suggest blueprints or detailed outlines of precisely what such a new anarchist order would be like. It was assumed that it would evolve gradually and naturally after the obstacles and inequities in the present system had been done away with. This transformation was to be accomplished by education and persuasion, not by application of terror and force.

This restoration of American anarchist thought to consideration by literate Americans which Dr. Martin has accomplished is not merely an impressive exercise in intellectual history or extensive indulgence in idle curiosity. The information it provides may have some practical significance for the human future—If there is to be any distant and happier human future. If our society survives the epochs or stages of the military state capitalism of the "Free Nations," fascism, communism, and the Orwellian nightmare, it may ultimately settle down in some non-coercive pattern possessing many traits similar to the ideal society anticipated and portrayed in native American anarchist thought.

---

*It should be remembered in addition that the assassination of President James A. Garfield by Charles J. Guiteau in 1881 took place at the time of the similar fate of Czar Alexander II of Russia at the hands of a professed nihilist. Both incidents aroused much comment in the radical press, and later publicists attempted to insinuate some relationship between these diversely motivated and widely separated acts of violence.

APPENDIX II

The Genealogy of Josiah Warren

"In an unmarked grave in Lot 2078, Eglantine Path, Mount Auburn Cemetery, Cambridge, Massachusetts, are interred the remains of Josiah Warren, a 19th century philosopher, inventor, and founder of utopian villages." So begins a short manuscript on the ancestry of Josiah Warren by a first cousin, three times removed, Lyman O. Warren, M.D., now (1970) of St. Petersburg, Florida.

After three years of unusual diligence and the conduct of a vast correspondence and investigation, Dr. Warren has established the proper descent of the "Peaceful Revolutionist," long a matter of scholarly interest.

In his possession for some time has been a family bible, published in London in 1770, handed down through his branch of the Warren family from the time of his grandfather's great grandfather, Captain Josiah Warren, a Revolutionary War soldier and Massachusetts farmer, born in Watertown, April 9, 1748.

On one of the blank pages in this bible had been recorded in long hand the names of each of the children of Captain Josiah, with the dates of their birth, marriage and death. From this data, and stimulated by having read in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* a paragraph on the famous American individualist, Dr. Warren proceeded to establish, with the help of Bond's *History of Watertown* and a veteran genealogist of Cambridge, W. Burton Webster, that "Josiah the Reformer,"* as Dr. Warren prefers to distinguish him, was the son of a second Josiah, the son of Captain Josiah, born in Watertown March 25, 1770. Mr. Webster uncovered in the records of the city of Lynn, Massachusetts, that the second Josiah, by that time a resident of "Little Cambridge" (now Brighton), married one Mary (Polley) Parker on December 25, 1793.

From the same source it was then established that "Josiah the Reformer" (who probably should be known as Josiah III) was the third of their five children, born in 1798. Additional research, involving sources

---

*Wrote Warren in 1854, "I really object to being called a *Reformer,* for no word is less calculated to place me in the position which I choose to occupy. If those classed as conservatives do not at once reject, without examination, everything called Reform, I think it argues a great share of courtesy on their part, as well as an almost unconquerable hope for improvement, not surpassed by those who have had experience as Reformers." *Periodical Letter,* I (July, 1854), 14.

ranging from *Historical Brighton* by J. P. C. Winship (Boston, 1899) to the facilities of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants, established that "Josiah the Reformer" was descended, through his grandfather, from Warrens of both Pilgrim and Puritan origin: Richard Warren, who was on the *Mayflower* when it put in at Plymouth in 1620, and John Warren of Watertown, who arrived at Massachusetts Bay on the *Arbella* in 1630.

The year of birth of "Josiah the Reformer" has never been in question, though no record of the day and month can be found in the vital statistics records of Boston, despite a prodigious effort to establish it. Precise dates have been located for an older brother and sister, born in Brighton. Then, some time after the birth of the second born, the family moved, presumably to Boston. But Dr. Warren points out that the records fall silent in the case of the "Peaceful Revolutionist," even though Masachusetts Vital Records, Deaths, gives his place of birth as Boston. In May 1969 Dr. Warren confirmed the evidence already uncovered by visits to the Mount Auburn Cemetery and to the Division of Vital Statistics in the State House in Boston.

"Josiah the Reformer" 's father, Josiah II, died July 9, 1809, in the former's eleventh year, but his mother lived until March 21, 1853. It would appear that she was about 23 years of age at the time of Josiah III's birth. Warren's failure to mention his parents or brother and sisters by name or to discuss his family at all in his extant correspondence or in any printed sources has been a source of mystery to this writer in particular. It was even believed by some at one time that he was an only child and an orphan at an early age. But we now know he was 55 years old when his mother died, that he was survived by the three girls in the family, and that his older brother died in Cincinnati in 1872, only two years before the "Reformer" 's passing.

Fully as puzzling is the absence of any mention of birth date, parents, or surviving members of the family in the substantial obituary which appeared in the *Boston Globe* the day after Warren died, April 14, 1874. But thanks to the efforts and persistence of Dr. Lyman O. Warren a satisfactory picture of the antecedents of the "Peaceful Revolutionist" is now a matter of record.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ANARCHIST SOURCE MATERIALS

a. Manuscript Collections

Baskette Collection, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois.
Labadie Collection, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Library of the Workingmen's Institute, New Harmony, Indiana.
Suffolk County Historical Society, Riverhead, Long Island, New York.

b. Bibliographies and Encyclopedias

ADAMS, FREDERICK B., JR.
Radical Literature in America. Stamford, Conn., 1939.
FAURE, SEBASTIEN (ed.)
L'Encyclopédie Anarchiste. 4 vols. Paris, n.d.
JOHNSON, ALLEN, and MALONE, DUMAS (eds.)
Dictionary of American Biography. 21 vols. New York, 1937.
KUNITZ, STANLEY J., and HAYCRAFT, HOWARD
American Authors, 1600-1900. New York, 1938.
LASSWELL, HAROLD, CASEY, RALPH D., and SMITH, BRUCE L.
Propaganda and Promotional Activities. An Annotated Bibliography. Minneapolis, 1935.

———

The National Cyclopedia of American Biography. 39 vols. New York, 1893-1942.
NETTLAU, MAX
Bibliographie de L'Anarchie. Paris and Brussels, 1897.
REESE, RENA
List of Books and Pamphlets in a Special Collection in the Library of the Workingmen's Institute, New Harmony, Ind. New Harmony, Ind., 1909.
STAMMHAMMER, JOSEF
Bibliographie des Socialismus und Communismus. 3 vols. Jena, 1893-1909.
TUCKER, BENJAMIN R.
B. R. Tucker's Unique Catalog of Adavnced Literature. New York, 1906.
WILSON, JAMES GRANT, and FISKE, JOHN (eds.)
Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography. 6 vols. New York, 1887-1889.
ZIMAND, SAVEL
Modern Social Movements; Descriptive Summaries and Bibliographies. New York, 1921.

c. Anarchist Books, Pamphlets, and Periodical Articles

ANDREWS, STEPHEN PEARL
The Science of Society. (No. 1. The True Constitution of Government in

the Sovereignty of the Individual as the Final Development of Protestantism, Democracy, and Socialism.) New York, 1852.

The Science of Society. (No. 2. Cost the Limit of Price: Scientific Measure of Honesty in Trade as One of the Fundamental Principles of the Solutions of the Social Problem.) New York, 1852.

"The Great American Crisis," *The Continental Monthly,* IV (December, 1863), 658-670; V (January, 1864), 87-89; (March, 1864), 300-317.

The Basic Outline of Universology. An Introduction to the Newly Discovered Science of the Universe; Its Elementary Principles, and the First Stages of Their Development in the Special Sciences. New York, 1872.

The Labor Dollar. Boston, 1881.

Love, Marriage and Divorce, and the Sovereignty of the Individual. A Discussion Between Henry James, Horace Greeley and Stephen Pearl Andrews. Boston, 1889.

The Sovereignty of the Individual. Berkeley Heights, N. J., 1938.

APPLETON, HENRY

What is Freedom and When Am I Free? Being an Attempt to Put Liberty on a Rational Basis and To Wrest Its Keeping From Irresponsible Pretenders in Church and State. Boston, 1888.

ARMAND, ERNEST (Pseud. Ernest Juin)

Iniziazione Individualista Anarchica. Florence, Italy, 1956.

BILGRAM, HUGO

The Iron Law of Wages. n.p., n.d.

Involuntary Idleness. Philadelphia, 1889.

A Study of the Money Question. New York, 1895.

"The Quantity Theory Scrutinized," *The Journal of Political Economy,* XXIX (November, 1921), 757-766.

The Remedy for Overproduction and Unemployment. New York, 1928.

BILGRAM, HUGO and LEVY, LOUIS EDWARD

The Cause of Business Depressions. Philadelphia, 1914. New Edition, Bombay, 1950.

BOOL, HENRY

Liberty Without Invasion, Means and End of Progress. Ithaca, N.Y., 1901.

Henry Bool's Apology for His Jeffersonian Anarchism. Ithaca, N. Y., 1901.

BROKAW, WARREN EDWIN

The Equitist Plan. Phoenix, Ariz., 1922.

Equitable Society and How To Create It. New York, 1927.

BYINGTON, STEVEN T.

"Benjamin Ricketson Tucker," *Man!,* VII (August, 1939), 517-518.

———

Chicago Conference on Trusts. Chicago, 1900.

COHEN, HENRY

Proudhon's Solution of the Social Problem. New York, 1927.

DE CLEYRE, VOLTAIRINE

Selected Works. New York, 1914.

———

Fifty Years After at Brentwood, Long Island, May 30th, 1905. Brentwood, Long Island, 1905.

FOWLER, CHARLES T.

The Labor Question. Princeton, Mass., n.d.

FULTON, EDWARD H.

Land, Money and Property (Liberty Library Nos. 8, 9). Columbus Junction, Iowa, 1896.

GORDAK, WILLIAM WALSTEIN

Adaptability to Environment. n.p., n.d.

GREENE, WILLIAM BRADFORD

Equality. West Brookfield, Mass., 1849.

Mutual Banking. West Brookfield, Mass., 1850.

The Radical Deficiency of the Existing Circulating Medium, and the Advantages of a Mutual Currency. Boston, 1857.

Sovereignty of the People. Boston, 1868.

Mutual Banking, Showing the Radical Deficiences of the Present Circulating Medium, and the Advantages of a Free Currency. Worcester, Mass., 1870.

The Facts of Consciousness and the Philosophy of Mr. Herbert Spencer. Boston, 1871.

Transcendentalism. Boston, 1871.

The Blazing Star. Boston, 1871.

The Working Woman. Boston, 1875.

Socialistic, Communistic, Mutualistic and Financial Fragments. Boston, 1875.

HANSON, WILLIAM

The Fallacies in Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" Exposed. Princeton, Mass., n.d.

HEYWOOD, EZRA H.

The Labor Party. New York, 1868.

Yours or Mine: An Essay To Show the True Basis of Property and the Causes of Its Inequitable Distribution. Princeton, Mass., 1873.

Uncivil Liberty: An Essay To Show the Injustice and Impolicy of Ruling Woman Without Her Consent. Princeton, Mass., 1873.

Hard Cash: An Essay To Show That Financial Monopolies Hinder Enterprise and Defraud Both Labor and Capital . . . Princeton, Mass., 1874.

The Great Strike: Its Relation to Labor, Property and Government. Princeton, Mass., 1878.

The Evolutionists: Being a Condensed Report of the Principles, Proposals and Methods of the Union Reform League. Princeton, Mass., 1882.

Free Speech: Report of Ezra H. Heywood's Defense Before the United States Court in Boston, April 10, 11 and 12, 1883;—Together with Judge Nelson's Charge to the Jury . . . Princeton, Mass., 1883.

Social Ethics: An Essay To Show That Since the Right of Private Judgment Must Be Respected in Morals As Well As in Religion, Free Rum, the Conceded Right of Choice in Beverages and Required Power to Decline Intoxicants Promotes Rational Sobriety and Assures Temperance. Princeton, Mass., 1889.

HEYWOOD, EZRA H. (ed.)

Declaration of Sentiments and Constitution of the New England Reform League. Boston, 1869.

INGALLS, JOSHUA KING
Land and Labor. Princeton, Mass., n.d.
Periodical Business Crises. New York, 1878.
Work and Wealth. Boston, 1881.
Social Wealth: the Sole Factors and Exact Ratios in Its Acquirement and Apportionment. New York, 1885.
Economic Equities: A Compend of the Natural Laws of Industrial Production and Exchange. New York, 1887.
Henry George Examined. Should Land Be Nationalized or Individualized? Princeton, Mass., 1888.
Social Industry, or the Sole Source of Increase. Sioux City, Iowa, 1891.
The Unrevealed Religion. Sioux City, Iowa, 1891.
Reminiscences of an Octogenarian in the Fields of Industrial and Social Reform. Elmira, N.Y., 1897.
KUEHN, HERMAN
The Problem of Worry: An Insurance Expert's Plan for Practical Commercial Credit Coöperation. Chicago, 1901.
LABADIE, JOSEPH A.
Anarchism: What It Is and What It Is Not. Detroit, 1896.
Essays by Jo Labadie. Detroit, 1911.
Anarchism: Genuine and Asinine. Wixom, Michigan, 1925.
Anarchism. Detroit, 1932.
LABADIE, LAURANCE
Anarchism Applied to Economics. Detroit, 1933.
LUM, DYER D.
Social Problems of Today; or the Mormon Question in Its Economic Aspects. Port Jervis, N.Y., 1886.
The Economics of Anarchy, A Study of the Industrial Type. Chicago, 1890.
Philosophy of Trade Unions. New York, 1892.
NATIONAL DEFENSE ASSOCIATION
United States vs. Heywood. Why the Defendant Should Be Released. New York, 1891.
PILLSBURY, PARKER
"Cupid's Yokes" and the Holy Scriptures Contrasted, in a Letter from Parker Pillsbury to Ezra H. Heywood. Boston, 1878.
PROUDHON, PIERRE JOSEPH
General Idea of the Revolution in the 19th Century (Translated from the French by John Beverly Robinson). London, 1923; reprinted, New York, 1969.
ROBINSON, JOHN BEVERLY
The New Christianity. New York, 1886.
"Why I Oppose Building Laws," *The Engineering Magazine,* II (November, 1891), 246-251.
Egoism. n.p., 1915.
Economics of Liberty. Minneapolis, 1916.
Rebuilding the World: An Outline of the Principles of Anarchism. Ann Arbor, 1917.
SCHULDER, FRED
The Relation of Anarchism to Organization. Cleveland, 1899

SPOONER, LYSANDER

Constitutional Law Relative to Credit, Currency and Banking. Worcester, Mass., 1843.

The Unconstitutionality of the Laws of Congress Prohibiting Private Mails. New York, 1844.

The Unconstitutionality of Slavery. Boston, 1845.

The Unconstitutionality of Slavery. Boston, 1856. (This edition contains the second part of the work, which originally appeared in 1847.)

Poverty: Its Illegal Causes and Legal Cure. Boston, 1846.

A Defence for Fugitive Slaves, Against the Acts of Congress of February 2, 1793, and September 18, 1850. Boston, 1850.

Illegality of the Trial of John W. Webster. Boston, 1850.

Who Caused the Reduction in Postage? Boston, 1851.

An Essay on the Trial by Jury. Boston, 1852.

The Law of Intellectual Property, or, An Essay on the Right of Authors and Inventors to a Perpetual Property in Their Ideas. Boston, 1885.

A New System of Paper Currency. Boston, 1861.

Considerations for Bankers and Holders of United States Bonds. Boston, 1864.

No Treason. (No. 1, The Suppression of the Rebellion Finally Disposes of the Pretence That the United States Government Rests on Consent.) Boston, 1867.

No Treason. (No. 2, The Constitution.) Boston, 1867.

No Treason. (No. 6, The Constitution of No Authority.) Boston, 1870. New Edition, Larkspur, Colorado, 1966.

A New Banking System: The Needful Capital for Rebuilding the Burnt District. Boston, 1873.

Our Financiers, Their Ignorance, Usurpations and Frauds. Boston, 1877.

The Law of Prices: A Demonstration of the Necessity for an Indefinite Increase of Money. Boston, 1877.

Gold and Silver as Standards of Value. Boston, 1878.

Universal Wealth Shown To Be Easily Attainable. Boston, 1879.

Revolution, the Only Remedy for the Oppressed Classes of Ireland, England, and Other Parts of the British Empire. No. 1, A Reply to "Dunraven." Boston, 1880.

Natural Law; or the Science of Justice; a Treatise on Natural Law, Natural Justice, Natural Rights, Natural Liberty, and Natural Society, Showing That All Legislation Whatsoever Is An Absurdity, a Usurpation and a Crime. Boston, 1882.

A Letter to Thomas F. Bayard: Challenging His Right and the Right of All Other So-called Senators and Representatives in Congress—to Exercise any Legislative Power Whatever Over the People of the United States. Boston, 1882. New Edition, Larkspur, Colorado, 1966.

A Letter to Grover Cleveland, On His False Inaugural Address, the Usurpations and Crimes of Lawmakers and Judges, and the Consequent Poverty, Ignorance and Servitude of the People. Boston, 1886.

STIRNER, MAX (Pseud. Johann Caspar Schmidt)

The Ego and His Own (Translated by Steven T. Byington). New York, 1907. New Edition, New York, 1963.

The False Principle of Our Education. (Translated by Robert H. Beebe.) Colorado Springs, 1967.

SWARTZ, CLARENCE LEE

What Is Mutualism? New York, 1927.

TANDY, FRANCIS D.

Free Competition. An Outline of the Principles of Philosophical Anarchism (Liberty Library No. 6). Columbus Junction, Iowa, 1896.

Modern Socialistic Tendencies (Liberty Library No. 4). Columbus Junction, Iowa, 1897.

TUCKER, BENJAMIN R.

Anarchism or Anarchy, A Discussion Between William H. Tillinghurst and B. R. Tucker. Boston, 1881.

Instead of a Book, by a Man too Busy to Write One. New York, 1893, 1969.

Henry George, Traitor. New York, 1896.

A Blow at Trial By Jury; An Examination of the Special Jury Law Passed By the New York Legislature in 1896. New York, 1898.

State Socialism and Anarchism, How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ. New York, 1899.

The Attitude of Anarchism Toward Industrial Combinations. New York, 1903.

Individual Liberty (Clarence Lee Swartz, editor). New York, 1926.

WALKER, JAMES L.

The Philosophy of Egoism. Denver, 1905.

WARREN, JOSIAH

Manifesto. New Harmony, Ind., 1841. (New edition, Berkeley Heights, N.J., 1952.)

A New System of Musical Notation. New Harmony, Ind., 1844.

Equitable Commerce: A New Developement [sic] *of Principles for the Harmonious Adjustment and Regulation of the Pecuniary, Intellectual and Moral Intercourse of Mankind, Proposed as Elements of New Society.* New Harmony, Ind., 1846.

Practical Details in Equitable Commerce, Showing the Workings in Actual Experiment, During a Series of Years, of the Social Principles Expounded in the Works Called "Equitable Commerce," by the Author of This, and "The Science of Society," by Stephen Pearl Andrews. New York, 1852.

Positions Defined (a leaflet). Village of Modern Times [L.I.], 1853.

Equitable Commerce (a leaflet). Boston, 1856.

Modern Education. Long Island, N.Y., 1861.

Modern Government and Its True Mission, A Few Words for the American Crisis. n.p., 1862.

True Civilization an Immediate Necessity and the Last Ground of Hope for Mankind. Being the Results and Conclusions of Thirty-nine Years' Laborious Study and Experiments in Civilization As It Is, and in Different Enterprises for Reconstruction. Boston, 1863.

The Emancipation of Labor. Boston, 1864.

True Civilization: A Subject of Vital and Serious Interest to All People But Most Immediately to Men and Women of Labor and Sorrow. Cliftondale, Mass., 1869.

Response to the Call of the National Labor Union. Boston, 1871.

Practical Applications of the Elementary Principles of "True Civilization" to the Minute Details of Every Day Life Being Part III, the Last of the "True Civilization" Series, and the Facts and Conclusions of Forty-Seven Years Study and Experiments in Reform Movements Through Communism To and In Elementary Principles, Found in a Direction Exactly Opposite to and Away From Communism, But Leading Directly to All the Harmonic Results Aimed at by Communism. Princeton, Mass., 1872.

Money, the Defects of Money Are the "Roots of All Evil." Charlestown, Mass., 1873.

Letter to E. H. Heywood. Princeton, Mass., 1873.

A Few Words to the Writer in a Paper Called "The Circular" on "The Sovereignty of the Individual. n.p., n.d.

WESTRUP, ALFRED B.

The Financial Problem: Its Relation to Labor Reform and Prosperity. Dallas, 1886.

Citizen's Money. San Francisco, 1890.

The New Philosophy of Money. Minneapolis, 1895. (2nd ed. rev. and enlarged, sub-titled *The Tragedy of Economics.* Chicago, 1915).

Plenty of Money. New York, 1899.

Address On a New System of Money Given at the Chicago Chapter of the American Institute of Banking Held in the Northwestern University Building May 23, 1916. Chicago, 1919.

Escucha! The Revelation of a Principle in Economic Science Unknown to Sociologists. Chicago, 1918.

YARROS, VICTOR S.

Anarchism: Its Aims and Methods. Boston, 1887.

"Historian Von Holst's 'Awakening': Are Labor's Claims Anti-Social?," *American Journal of Politics,* V (November, 1894), 496-503.

"This Year's Strikes and the Present Industrial Situation," *Review of Reviews,* XXX (October, 1904), 430-433.

"The Story of the I. W. W. Trial," *The Survey,* XL (August 31, 1918), 603-604; (September 7, 1918), 630-632; (September 14, 1918), 660-663.

"The I. W. W. Trial," *Nation,* CVII (August 31, 1918), 220-223.

Our Revolution; Essays in Interpretation. Boston, 1920.

"Philosophical Anarchism: Its Rise, Decline and Eclipse," *The American Journal of Sociology,* XLI (January, 1936), 470-483.

"Toward the American Commonwealth: Independent Pragmatic Radicalism," *The Social Frontier,* V (December, 1938), 89-90.

"The Persistence of Utopian Thinking," *The Social Frontier,* V (June, 1939), 264-268.

"Philosophical Anarchism (1880-1910)," *Journal of Social Philosophy,* VI (April, 1941), 254-262.

Adventures in the Realm of Ideas. Girard, Kan., 1947.

d. Anarchist and Semi-Anarchist Newspapers and Periodicals

The Advance. Mount Juliet, Tennessee, 1911-1912.

The Age of Thought. Columbus Junction, Iowa, 1896-1898.
The Alarm. Chicago and New York, 1883-1889.
The Anarchist. London, 1885-1886.
Der Arme Teufel. Detroit, 1884-1900.
The Auditor. Chicago, 1891.
The Beacon. San Diego and San Francisco, 1890-1891.
The Coming Era. Dallas, 1898.
The Eagle and the Serpent. London and Chicago, 1898-1902, 1927.
Ego. Clinton, Iowa, 1921-1923.
Egoism. San Francisco and Oakland, 1891-1897.
The Egoist. Clinton, Iowa, 1923-1924.
L'En Dehors. Orleans, France, 1922-1939.
Enfant Terrible. San Francisco, 1891.
The Equitist. Haskell Flats, N.Y., and Phoenix, Ariz., 1897, 1927-1933.
The Equitist. Del Rosa, Calif., 1928-1933.
Equity, Liberal, Missouri, 1886-1887.
L'Ere Nouvelle. Paris, 1905-1906.
Fair Play. Valley Falls, Kan., and Sioux City, Iowa, 1898-1908.
The Firebrand. Portland, Oregon, 1895-1897.
The Firebrand. Mount Juliet, Tennessee, and Sweden, Texas, 1909-1910.
The Free Comrade. Wellesley, Mass., 1900-1902, 1910-1912.
The Free Lance. Minneapolis and St. Paul, 1916.
Herald of Equity. Cincinnati, 1841.
Humanity First. Xenia, Ill., and Riverdale, Md., 1919-1920.
I. Wellesley, Mass., 1898-1900.
Instead of a Magazine. Minneapolis, 1915-1916.
Liberty. Boston and New York, 1881-1908.
Lucifer, the Light Bearer. Valley Falls, Kan., Topeka and Chicago, 1890-1907.
The Mutualist. Clinton, Iowa and Peoria, Ill., 1925-1928.
The New Order. Clinton, Iowa, 1919.
The Peaceful Revolutionist. Cincinnati, 1833.
The Peaceful Revolutionist. Devoted to The Practical Details of Equitable Commerce. Utopia, Ohio, 1848.
The Periodical Letter on the Principles and Progress of the "Equity Movement." Long Island, N.Y., and Boston, 1854-1858.
The Quarterly Letter. Devoted Mainly to Showing the Practical Applications and Progress of Equity. Cliftondale, Mass., 1867.
The Radical Review. New Bedford, Mass., 1877-1878.
Le Sémeur. Santiago de Puriscal, Costa Rica, 1926-1929.
The 1776 American. Clinton, Iowa, 1920.
The Sun. Kansas City, Mo., 1887.
Today. Nashville, Tennessee, 1905.
L'Unique. Orleans, France, 1945-1952.
Western Tiller. Cincinnati, Ohio, 1827.
Winn's Firebrand. Mount Juliet, Tennessee, 1902-1903.
The Word. Princeton and Cambridge, Mass., 1872-1890, 1892-1893.

2. OTHER RELATED PRIMARY MATERIALS

a. Books, Pamphlets and Periodical Articles

BADCOCK, JOHN, JR.
Slaves to Duty. Detroit, 1938. (First published 1894).
BECK, WILLIAM (publisher)
Money and Banking or Their Nature and Effects Considered. Together With a Plan For the Universal Diffusion of Their Legitimate Benefits Without Their Evils, By a Citizen of Ohio. Cincinnati, 1839.
Prospectus of the United States General Balancing Office: An Effectual Substitute for Money and Banking. Cincinnati, n.d.
COMMONS, JOHN R., and ASSOCIATES
A Documentary History of American Industrial Society. 10 vols. Cleveland, 1910.
COMTE, AUGUSTE
Appel aux Conservateurs. Paris, 1855.
CONWAY, MONCURE D.
"Modern Times, New York," *The Fortnightly Review,* I (July, 1865), 421-434.
Autobiography, Memories and Experiences. 2 vols. Boston, 1904.
EDGER, HENRY
Modern Times, The Labor Question and the Family. Modern Times [L.I.], 1855.
August Comte and the Middle Ages. Presbourg, Hungary, 1885.
ELLIS, JOHN B.
Free Love and Its Votaries; or, American Socialism Unmasked. San Francisco, 1870.
EVANS, FREDERICK WILLIAM
Autobiography of a Shaker. New York, 1888.
HIATT, JOEL W., (ed.)
"Diary of William Owen From November 10, 1824, to April 20, 1825," Indiana Historical Society *Publications,* IV (Indianapolis, 1906), 7-134.
INGLIS, AGNES
"A Reminiscence of John Beverley Robinson." Unpublished, Ann Arbor, 1940.
INGRAM, JOHN K.
Passages From the Letters of Auguste Comte. London, 1901.
ISHILL, JOSEPH (ed.)
Free Vistas. 2 vols. Berkeley Heights, N.J., 1933-1937.
Correspondencia Selecta de Joseph Ishill (Edited by Vladimir Muñoz). Mexico City, 1967.
KELLOGG, EDWARD
Labor and Other Capital: the Rights of Each Secured and the Wrongs of Both Eradicated. New York, 1849.
LAGARRIGUE, JORGE (ed.)
Lettres d'Auguste Comte, Fondateur de la Religion Universelle et Premier Grandeprêtre de L'Humanité à Henry Edger, et à John Metcalfe . . . Paris, 1889.

MASQUERIER, LEWIS

Sociology: or, the Reconstruction of Society, Government and Property. New York, 1877.

The Sataniad, or Contest of the Gods for the Dominion of Heaven and Earth. New York, 1877.

MILL, JOHN STUART

Autiobiography. London, 1875.

NICHOLS, THOMAS LOW

Forty Years of American Life. 2 vols. London, 1864.

NOLD, CARL

"Fifty Years Ago," *Man!*, II (January, 1934), 85, 88. (Pittsburgh Anarchist Congress.)

NOYES, JOHN HUMPHREY

History of American Socialisms. Philadelphia, 1870.

OWEN, ROBERT DALE

"My Experience of Community Life," *Atlantic Monthly,* XXXII (September, 1873), 336-348.

PARE, WILLIAM

"Equitable Villages in America," *Journal of the Statistical Society of London,* XIX (June, 1856), 127-143.

Co-operative Agriculture: a Solution of the Land Question as Exemplified in the History of the Ralahine Co-operative Agricultural Association, County Clare, Ireland. London, 1870.

PHILLIPS, WENDELL

Review of Lysander Spooner's Essay on the Unconstitutionality of Slavery. Boston, 1847.

———————

"Triallville and Modern Times," *Chambers' Edinburgh Journal,* XVIII (December 18, 1852), 395-397.

REDBEARD, RAGNAR (Pseud.?)

Might is Right, or the Survival of the Fittest. London, 1910; Chicago, 1927.

RIEGEL, E. C.

Private Enterprise Money. New York, 1944.

TROWBRIDGE, JOHN T.

"A Reminiscence of the Pantarch," *The Independent,* IV (February 26, 1903), 497-501.

WALKER, AMASA

"Modern Alchemy," *The Banker's Magazine and Statistical Register,* XI, new series (December, 1861), 407-416.

WARREN, GEORGE W.

"Josiah Warren," unpublished, Evansville, Ind., 1893.

b. Other Related Periodicals

The Altruist. St. Louis, Mo., 1895-1905.

The Arbitrator. Denver, 1889.

The Art of Living. Modern Times, L.I., N.Y., 1852.

Boston Investigator. Boston, 1848-1857.

The Free Enquirer. New York, 1828-1832.

Free Society. San Francisco, 1897-1904.
The Free Soiler. New York, 1884.
The Free Thinker's Magazine. Buffalo, N.Y., 1882-1893.
The Index. Toledo and Boston, 1870-1873, 1873-1880.
International Intelligence Institute Bulletin. New York, 1912-1914.
Labor Exchange Guide. Denver, 1897.
The Libertarian. Los Angeles, 1923-1924.
The New Harmony Gazette. New Harmony, Ind., 1825-1828.
Solidarity. New York, 1892-1895, 1898. This should not be confused with the I. W. W. paper of the same name.
The Spirit of the Age. New York, 1850-1852.
The Spiritual Age. New York, 1857.
The Truth Seeker. New York, 1883-1905.
Twentieth Century Magazine. New York, 1888-1896.
The Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly. New York, 1870-1876.

c. Newspapers (incomplete files)

Boston Globe.
Boston Herald.
The Indiana Statesman. New Harmony, Ind.
New Bedford Standard. New Bedford, Mass.
New York Herald.
New York Home Journal.
New York Tribune.

3. GENERAL WORKS AND SECONDARY AUTHORITIES

ADAMIC, LOUIS
Dynamite, the Story of Class Violence in America. London, 1931.
ADAMS, GRACE, and HUTTER, EDWARD
The Mad Forties. New York, 1942.
ARMAND, ERNEST (Pseud. Ernest Juin)
Formas de Vida in Común sin Estado no Autoridad. Madrid, 1934.
BAILIE, WILLIAM
Josiah Warren, The First American Anarchist. Boston, 1906.
BASCH, VICTOR
L'Individualisme Anarchiste Max Stirner. Paris, 1894.
BEARD, CHARLES A.
Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy. New York, 1915.
BEARD, MARY RITTER
A Short History of the American Labor Movement. New York, 1928.
BECK, FRANK O.
Hobohemia. West Rindge, N.H., 1956.
BECKER, CARL LOTUS
The Declaration of Independence; A Study in the History of Political Ideas. New York, 1942.
BERNARD, LUTHER LEE, and BERNARD, JESSIE
Origins of American Sociology: The Social Science Movement in the United States. New York, 1943.

BRISSENDEN, PAUL F.
The I. W. W., A Study of American Syndicalism. New York, 1919.
BROOKS, VAN WYCK
The Flowering of New England, 1815-1865. New York, 1936.
BROUN, HEYWOOD C., and LEECH, MARGARET
Anthony Comstock, Roundsman of the Lord. New York, 1927.
BROWN, JETHRO
The Message of Anarchy. Riverside, Conn., 1912. (Reprinted from *Hibbert Journal*, July, 1910.)
CALVERTON, VICTOR F.
Where Angels Dared to Tread. Indianapolis, 1941.

———

The Cambridge History of American Literature. 3 vols. New York, 1921.
CARLETON, FRANK T.
"The Workingmen's Party of New York City," *Political Science Quarterly,* XXII (September, 1907), 401-415.
CARPENTER, WILLIAM S.
The Development of American Political Thought. Princeton, N.J., 1930.
CHANDLER, ALFRED NOBBIT
Land Title Origins; A Tale of Force and Fraud. New York, 1945.
CHODOROV, FRANK
The Myth of the Post Office. New York, 1948.
CLARK, FREDERICK C.
"A Neglected Socialist," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* V (March, 1895), 718-739. (Wilhelm Weitling.)
COKER, FRANCIS W.
Recent Political Thought. New York, 1934.
COMMONS, JOHN R., and ASSOCIATES
History of Labor in the United States. 4 vols. New York, 1918-1935.
CONRAD, LAWRENCE H.
"Jo Labadie—Poet," *Michigan History Magazine,* XVI (Spring, 1932), 218-224.
CURTI, MERLE
Peace or War; The American Struggle, 1636-1936. New York, 1936.
DAVID, HENRY
The History of the Haymarket Affair. New York, 1936.
DESTLER, CHESTER MacARTHUR
The Influence of Edward Kellogg Upon American Radicalism, 1865-1896. Chicago, 1932.
"Shall Red and Black Unite? An American Revolutionary Document of 1883," *Pacific Historical Review,* XIV (December, 1945), 434-451.
American Radicalism, 1865-1901. New London, Conn., 1946.
DORFMAN, JOSEPH
The Economic Mind in American Civilization. 3 vols. New York, 1946-1949.
DOUGLAS, DOROTHY W.
"Josiah Warren," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* XV, 364-365.
DUSS, JOHN S.
Harmonists; A Personal History. Harrisburg, Pa., 1943.

DYSON, VERNE
A Century of Brentwood. Brentwood, L.I., N.Y., 1950.
Supplement & Index: An After-piece to A Century of Brentwood. Brentwood, L.I., N.Y., 1953.
EGBERT, DONALD D., and PERSONS, STOW
Socialism and American Life. 2 vols. Princeton, 1952.
ELTZBACHER, PAUL
Anarchism (Translated from the German by Steven T. Byington). New York, 1908. New Edition, New York, 1960.
ELY, RICHARD T.
The Labor Movement in America. New York, 1886.
FROTHINGHAM, OCTAVIUS B.
Gerrit Smith; A Biography. New York, 1879.
GEIGER, GEORGE RAYMOND
The Philosophy of Henry George. Grand Forks, N.D., 1931.
GETTEL, RAYMOND G.
History of American Political Thought. New York, 1928.
GHIO, PAUL
L'Anarchisme aux Etats-Unis. Paris, 1903.
HAWKINS, RICHMOND L.
Positivism in the United States (1853-1861). Cambridge, Mass., 1938.
HIGGINSON, THOMAS WENTWORTH
Cheerful Yesterdays. Boston, 1898.
HILLQUIT, MORRIS
History of Socialism in the United States. New York, 1906.
HINDS, WILLIAM A.
American Communities. Chicago, 1902.
HOFSTADTER, RICHARD
Social Darwinism in American Thought, 1860-1915. Philadelphia, 1944.
HOLYOAKE, GEORGE J.
The History of Co-operation in England; Its Literature and Its Advocates. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1875-1879.
HUNTER, ROBERT
Violence and the Labor Movement. New York, 1914.
KELLAR, HERBERT ANTHONY
Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist. (Indiana Historical Society *Collections,* Vol. XXI.) 2 vols. Indianapolis, 1936.
KEPPEL, ARNOLD J. W.
The Theory of the Cost-Price System. London, 1928.
LAMARZELLE, GUSTAVE de
L'Anarchie dans le Monde Moderne. Paris, 1919.
LOCKRIDGE, ROSS, Sr.
Old Fauntleroy Home. New Harmony, Ind., 1939.
LOCKWOOD, GEORGE BROWNING
The New Harmony Movement. Marion, Ind., 1902.
LOMBROSO, CESARE
Gli Anarchici. Turin, 1894.
MADISON, CHARLES A.
"Benjamin R. Tucker: Individualist and Anarchist," *New England Quar-*

terly, XVI (September, 1943), 444-467.

"Anarchism in the United States," *Journal of the History of Ideas,* VI (January, 1945), 46-66.

Critics and Crusaders. New York, 1947.

MANN, ARTHUR

Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age, 1880-1900. Cambridge, Mass., 1954.

MARTIN, EVERETT DEAN

The Conflict of the Individual and the Mass in the Modern World. New York, 1932.

MARTIN, JAMES J.

"Agnes Inglis: Recollections and Impressions," *Resistance,* II (August, 1953), 11-13, 18.

"American Prophets (I): Josiah Warren," *Liberation,* II (December, 1957), 10-14.

Articles, "Alexander Berkman," "Emma Goldman," "Benjamin R. Tucker," *Dictionary of American Biography,* XXII (New York, 1958).

"A Beginner's Manual for Apprentice Bookburners," *Amateur Book Collector,* V (December, 1954), 1-8.

Introductions to new edition of Lysander Spooner's *No Treason* and *A Letter to Thomas F. Bayard* (Larkspur, Colorado, 1966).

Introduction to new edition of Paul Eltzbacher's *Anarchism.* (New York, 1960).

Introduction to new edition of Max Stirner's *The Ego and His Own.* (New York, 1963).

MARTYN, CARLOS (ed.)

Wendell Phillips, The Agitator. Boston, 1890.

MERRIAM, CHARLES E. and BARNES, HARRY E. (eds.)

History of Political Theories. New York, 1924.

MOSCA, GAETANO

The Ruling Class. New York, 1939.

NAQUET, ALFRED J.

L'Anarchisme et le Collectivisme. Paris, 1904.

NETTLAU, MAX

Der Vorfrűhling der Anarchie; ihre Historische Entwicklung den Anfängen bis zum Jahre 1864. Berlin, 1925.

Der Anarchismus von Proudhon zu Kropotkin; seine Historische Entwicklung in den Jahre 1859-1880. Berlin, 1927.

Anarchisten und Sozial-Revolutionäre; die Historische Entwicklung des Anarchismus in den Jahren 1880-1886. Berlin, 1931.

Esbozo de Historia de las Utopias. Buenos Aires, 1934.

La Anarquia a través de los Tiempos. Barcelona, 1935.

NICHOLSON, MEREDITH

The Hoosiers. New York, 1900.

OPPENHEIMER, FRANZ

The State. Indianapolis, 1914; New York, 1926.

OSGOOD, HERBERT L.

"Scientific Anarchism," *Political Science Quarterly,* IV (March, 1889), 1-36.

PARKER, ROBERT A.

A Yankee Saint; John Humphrey Noyes and the Oneida Community. New York, 1935.

PARRINGTON, VERNON LEWIS

Main Currents in American Thought. 3 vols. New York, 1927-1930.

PERLMAN, SELIG

A History of Trade Unionism in the United States. New York, 1923.

PERKINS, ALICE J. G., and WOLFSON, THERESA

Frances Wright, Free Enquirer. New York, 1939.

PODMORE, FRANK

Robert Owen, A Biography. 2 vols. New York, 1910.

POST, ALBERT

Popular Freethought in America, 1825-1850. (Columbia University, *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law,* No. 497.) New York, 1943.

READ, HERBERT

The Politics of the Unpolitical. London, 1943.

RILEY, THOMAS A.

"New England Anarchism in Germany," *New England Quarterly,* XVIII (March, 1945), 25-38.

"Anti-Statism in German Literature," Modern Language Association of America *Publications,* LXII (September, 1947), 828-843.

ROCKER, RUDOLF

Johann Most, das Leben eines Rebellen. Berlin, 1924.

Nationalism and Culture. Los Angeles, 1937.

La Juventud de un Rebelde. Buenos Aires, 1947.

Pioneers of American Freedom. Los Angeles, 1949.

RUDIGER, HELMUT

Federalismen. Stockholm, 1947.

RUSSELL, BERTRAND

Proposed Roads to Freedom; Socialism, Anarchism and Syndicalism. New York, 1931.

SACHS, EMANIE LOUISE

"The Terrible Siren," Victoria Woodhull (1838-1927). New York, 1928.

SAKOLSKI, AARON M.

The Great American Land Bubble. New York, 1932.

SANBORN, ALVAN F.

Paris and the Social Revolution. Boston, 1905.

SCHNECK, JACOB, and OWEN, RICHARD

The History of New Harmony, Ind. Evansville, Ind., 1890.

SCHUSTER, EUNICE M.

"Native American Anarchism," Smith College *Studies in History,* XVII (October, 1931-July, 1932), 5-197.

SELDES, GILBERT V.

The Stammering Century. New York, 1928.

SELIGMAN, EDWIN R. A.

Essays in Economics. New York, 1925.

SERNICOLI, E.

L'Anarchia e gli Anarchici; Studio Storico e Politico. 2 vols. Milan, 1894.

SPRADING, CHARLES T.
Liberty and the Great Libertarians. Los Angeles, 1913.
STAMMLER, RUDOLF
Die Theorie des Anarchismus. Berlin, 1894.
STEARNS, BERTHA-MONICA
"Two Forgotten New England Reformers," *New England Quarterly,* VI (March, 1933), 59-84. (Thomas L. Nichols and his wife.)
STEDMAN, LAURA, and GOULD, GEORGE M.
Life and Letters of Edmund Clarence Stedman. 2 vols. New York, 1910.
SWIFT, LINDSAY
Brook Farm. New York, 1900.
SYMES, LILLIAN, and CLEMENT, TRAVERS
Rebel America ; The Story of Social Revolt in the United States. New York, 1934.
TRAUBEL, HORACE
With Walt Whitman in Camden. 3 vols. New York, 1914-1915.
TYLER, ALICE FELT
Freedom's Ferment. Phases of American Social History to 1860. Minneapolis, 1944.
WEISBORD, ALBERT
Conquest of Power. 2 vols. New York, 1937.
WISH, HARVEY
"Stephen Pearl Andrews, American Pioneer Sociologist," *Social Forces,* XIX (May, 1941), 477-482.
ZENKER, ERNST VICTOR
Anarchism, A Criticism and History of Anarchist Theory. New York, 1897.
ZOCCOLI, ETTORE G.
I Gruppi Anarchici degli Stati Uniti e L'Opera di Max Stirner. Modena, 1901.
L'Anarchia. Turin, 1907.

INDEX OF NAMES AND AUTHORS

Abbot, Francis, 204, 206, 232
Aberdeen, Lord, 90
Adams, F. B., Jr., 280
Adams, Grace, 73, 279
Adams, Pres. John, 133
Adams, Samuel, 175
Addams, Jane, 243
Albion, R. G., 90
Alcott, Bronson, 114
Alexander, A. J., 185
Alexander II, Czar, 219, 291
Allen, Charles A., 167
Altgeld, J. P., 243, 264, 266
Andrade, D. A., 270
Andrews, E. B., 271
Andrews, J. B., 285
Andrews S. P., xi, 9, 40, 62, 65-72, 75, 77, 89, 93, 103, 115-6, 123, 138, 142, 153-66, 171-2, 204, 206-7, 242, 258
Anthony, S. B., 114
Appleton, Henry, 166, 206, 224, 235, 243, 245-9, 252, 261
Armand, E. (pseud.), x, 202
Aveling, Edward, 235

Babcock, J. M. L., 122
Babelon, E. C. F., 281
Bailie, William, 5, 257-8, 285
Bakunin, Michael, x, 91, 203, 213, 219, 223, 277, 280
Baldwin, Roger, 276
Ballou, Adin, viii, 3, 76-7
Barnes, H. E., 4-5, 285, 289-91
Barnhill, J. B., 254
Bartol, C. H., 206
Baskette, E. C., 206-7, 275-6, 279
Bastiat, Frederic, 209
Batchelor, George, 154
Bates, E. S., 153
Bayard, T. F., 199-200
Bayliss, James, 27-8
Beard, M. R., 4, 285
Beck, William, 40-1
Beecher, H. W., 116, 118, 162
Beeney, Henry, 115, 140
Bell, T. H., 261
Bellamy, Edward, 227, 237
Berger, Octave, 270
Bergman, C. W., 269
Berkman, Alexander, x, 226, 247, 267, 287, 291
Bernard, Jessie, 162, 166
Bernard, L. L., 162, 166
Besant, Annie, 124
Bestor, A. E., Jr., iii, 3-4
Bilgram, Hugo, 256
Binder, R. M., x
Blacker, P. I., 83
Bliss, W. D. P., x, 271, 286
Bolton, Samuel, 40
Bool, Henry, 268, 271, 275
Borome, Joseph, 66
Bowen, J. L., 136
Boyle, A. F., 153-4
Bray, J. F., 11, 116, 223
Brenan, Gerald, vii, 72
Brisbane, Albert, 4, 115-6, 119
Brisbane, Redelia, 4, 56
Brogan, D. W., 12
Brokaw, W. E., 253, 261, 274
Bromberg, Walter, 71
Brooks, Van Wyck, 4, 288
Broun, Heywood, 122, 279
Brown, H. G., 230
Brown, Paul, 28
Bullock, William, 39
Burnham, James, 56, 278
Burns, Alexander, Jr., 45, 48
Burton, F. R., 241
Byington, S. T., 202, 254, 257, 274, 281, 283

Cabet, Etienne, 4, 77
Cafiero, Carlo, 220, 222
Calhoun, J. C., 33
Calverton, V. F., 3
Camp, Hezekiah, 27
Campbell, F. S. (pseud.), 287
Casey, R. D., 280
Cassirer, Ernst, 194
Chafee, Zechariah, Jr., 105
Chambrun, C. L. de, 15
Chandler, A. N., 15
Channing, W. E., 72
Channing, W. H., 135, 142
Chapin, H. D., 241
Chase, Elizabeth B., 124
Chiaromonte, Nicola, 287
Chodorov, Frank, 172
Cipriani, Amilcare, 220
Claflin, Tennessee, 118
Clark, F. C., 4, 93
Clay, Henry, 45
Clement, Travers, 279
Cleveland, Pres. Grover, 200-1
Codman, C. A., 68, 72, 80, 83, 86
Codman, J. T., 4

Cohen, Henry, 12, 255-6, 260, 274
Cole, G. D. H., 6
Coleman, J. W., 121
Colman, John, 133
Commager, H. S., 4
Commerford, John, 140
Commons, J. R., vii, 4, 13, 20, 41, 81, 106, 140, 154, 271, 284-5
Comstock, Anthony, 75, 85, 121, 279
Comte, Auguste, 77-80, 158, 161-2, 165, 238
Considerant, Victor, 56
Conway, M. D., 83, 85
Cooley, Charles, 162
Cooper, Peter, 147, 161
Cornell, John P., 57
Cortwright, John, 194
Coxey, Jacob, 264
Craske, Charles, 39
Cubberley, E. G., 59, 64
Cuddon, A. C., 90-2
Curti, M. E., 105, 192, 287
Czolgosz, Leon, 291

Dame, W. V., 83
Dana, Charles, 72, 142
Danielewicz, Sigismund, 223
Daniels, Miriam, 261
Darwin, Charles, 235
David, Henry, vi
Davis, A. J., 124
Davis, A. McF., 133
Davis, Jefferson, 266
Davis, John, 167
Day, S. M., 91
Debs, Eugene, 247, 264-5
De Cleyre, V., 259, 261
Dejacque, Joseph, 93-4
De Leon, Daniel, 227
Dennis, Lawrence, 56
Denton, E. M. F., 122, 124
Denton, William, 116
Destler, C. McA., x, 126
De Vinne, T. L., 46
Devyr, Thomas, 117
Donisthorpe, Wordsworth, 270
Dorfman, Joseph, 288
Douglas, P. H., 284
Douglass, Frederick, 141
Dubois, Felix, 283
Duganne, A. J. H., 140
Duhamel, Georges, 274
Dumas, Georges, 78
Dunn, Edward, 27-8
Dunn, J. P., 8
Durand, Elias, 40
Duss, J. S., 3-4, 7
Dwight, J. S., 65
Dyson, Verne, 70, 84

Eastman, Max, 275
Edelmann, J. H., 223
Edger, Henry, 69-71, 77-80, 82, 158, 206
Edwards, Jonathan, 126
Egbert, D. D., 286
Elliott, W. P., 39
Ellis, J. B., 85, 87
Eltzbacher, Paul, 271, 281-3
Ely, R. T., viii, 4-5, 9, 13, 22, 255, 265, 284
Emerson, R. W., 135
Engels, Friedrich, 56
Eubank, Thomas, 47
Evans, F. H., 3
Evans, F. W., 28, 116
Evans, G. H., 3, 36, 45, 66, 81, 140, 144

Faris, Ellsworth, 254
Fauntleroy, Mary, 35
Faure, Sebastien, 280
Ferrer, Francisco, 261
Field, D. D., 161
Fielden, Samuel, 225, 266-7
Fifield, A. C., 269
Fischer, Adolph, 225, 266
Fish, C. R., 28, 34, 37, 73
Fiske, John, 126, 206
Folger, Richard, 20
Fory, J. C., 39
Fourier, Charles, 38, 56, 76, 119, 157, 159, 161-2, 165
Fowler, Charles T., 114, 259
Fox, D. R., 28
Fox, W. P., 27-8
Frick, H. C., 267, 291
Frothingham, O. B., 4, 73, 135, 140, 181, 206
Frothingham, Richard, 5
Fulton, E. H., 259-60, 274

Gabriel, R. H., 287
Garfield, Pres. J. A., 122, 265-6, 291
Garrison, W. L., viii, 33, 105, 180
George, Henry, 53, 112, 147-9, 229-31, 255, 260
George III, King, 193
Gettell, R. G., 285
Ghio, Paul, 283
Gibbs, Mildred, viii
Giddings, Joshua, 45
Gide, Andre, 287
Giles, A. E., 105
Giles, Henry, 135
Gilmore, H. S., 57
Gladden, Washington, 120
Godkin, E. L., 264-5
Godwin, William, v
Gohdes, C. L. F., 4
Goldenweiser, Alexander, 78
Goldman, Emma, x, 226, 247, 260, 267, 276, 287

Gonner, E. C. K., 11
Goodkind, H. M., 172
Gordak, W. W., 258
Gouge, W. M., 127
Gould, G. M., 159
Gowen, Franklin, 121
Graham, Sylvester, 139
Grant, Pres. U.S., 192
Gray, John, 11, 156
Greeley, Horace, 4, 72, 75, 156-58, 171, 266-7
Greene, W. B., xi, 65, 100, 103, 106, 109, 111, 114-7, 119, 125-138, 144, 162, 172, 175-6, 203-6, 211-2, 240, 255-6, 259, 275
Greene, Nathaniel, 125
Gregory, J. D., 124
Greusel, J. H., 270
Gronlund, Laurence, 227, 286
Grossman, Jonathan, 114
Guiteau, C. J., 266, 291

Haines, C. G., 185
Hall, W. P., 90
Hammond, Bray, 127
Hamon, A. F., 280-1
Hanson, William, 206, 255
Harlow, R. V., 140, 181
Harmon, Moses, 247, 258
Harris, Sen. I. G., 262
Hart, A. B., 133
Hartmann, Leo, 220
Haskell, B. G., 222-4, 244
Hawkins, R. L., 69-71, 78-80
Haycraft, Howard, 5, 153
Hayes, Pres. R. B., 122
Hearst, W. R., Sr., 265
Hegel, G. W. F., 12
Hennacy, Ammon, 76
Heywood, Angela T., 122
Heywood, Ceres B., 105
Heywood, E. H., xi, 30, 103, 105-25, 137-8, 144-5, 162-5, 202-7, 240, 242, 256, 259
Heywood, W. S., 3, 76
Hiatt, J. W., 7, 12
Higginson, T. W., 126, 135-6
Hildreth, Richard, 127
Hillquit, Morris, ix, 286
Hinds, W. A., 2
Hine, Louis, 140
Hoagland, H. E., 4, 41, 285
Hoar, E. R., 135
Hobbs, Thomas, 194
Hodgson, Thomas, 46
Hoffer, Eric, 278
Holdsworth, W. S., 185
Holmes, S. E., 261
Holmes, William, 260
Holyoake, G. J., 89, 91
Hovell, Mark, 89
Hull, Moses, 122
Hunt, Freeman, 141
Hunt, J. H., 141
Hunter, Robert, vii
Hussey, E. B., 156
Hutchinson, Eugene, 100
Hutchinson, Thomas, 133-4
Hutter, Edward, 73, 279

Ibsen, Henrik, 254
Ingalls, J. K., xii, 66, 100, 103, 115, 139-53, 203, 206, 230, 242
Inglis, Agnes, 94, 105, 282
Ingram, J. K., 78
Ishill, Joseph, 42, 202, 254, 269, 270
Ishill, R. F., 270

Jackson, Pres. Andrew, 2
Jacobi, C. T., 39
James, C. L., 261
James, Henry, 72, 75, 135, 156-7, 162
Janes, G. M., 6
Jaszi, Oscar, 279
Jefferson, Pres. Thomas, 194
Jewett, C. C., 65-7
Johnson, Allen, 5
Johnson, A. B., 32, 40
Johnson, E. A. J., 12
Jones, Lloyd, 6
Joslin, L. K., 114
Juenger, Friedrich, 274

Kaler, Emil, 4, 93
Kehn, E. A., 172
Kellar, H. A., 47
Kellogg, Edward, xii, 114, 120, 126, 134, 142, 156
Kelsen, Hans, 185
Kelly, Alan, 243
Kelly, F. F., 243
Kelly, Gertrude B., 243, 252, 255
Kelly, John F., 235, 243, 252-3
Kendrick, Laura, 122
Keyser, John H., 117
King, William, 89
Koenig, William, 40
Koopman, H. L., 270
Kriege, Mathilde, 71
Kropotkin, P. A., iv, vii, x, 92, 94, 219-20, 222, 226, 260, 277, 279
Kubler, George A., 39, 47
Kuehn, Herman, 255, 274
Kunitz, S. J., 5, 153

Labadie, J. A., 243-5, 253, 257, 260, 263, 271, 274
Labadie, Laurance, xi, 209, 254, 269
Lagarrigue, Jorge, 77, 79
Laidler, H. W., 286
Lamarzelle, Gustave de, 283
Laski, H. J., 279

Lassalle, Ferdinand, 226
Lasswell, Harold, 280
Lasvignes, Henri, 283
Latouche, Peter, iv
Lavroff, Pierre, 220
Lazarus, M. E., 151, 243, 247-8, 252
Leech, Margaret, 122, 279
Lehning, A. M., 91, 94
Leopold, R. W., 24
Levy, L. E., 256
Liebknecht, Karl, 235
Lilburne, John, viii
Lincoln, Anne E., 24
Lindley, Harlow, 8
Linton, Edward, 83, 102, 118, 163
Lloyd, H. D., 241, 264
Lloyd, J. W., 202, 232, 235, 243, 247, 253, 258
Lockwood, G. B., 3-4, 7, 285
Lombroso, Cesare, vi, 280-1
Long, William, 62
Longfellow, Samuel, 206
Longworth, Nicholas, 15
Loring, G. B., 135
Lowell, A. L., 265
Lum, D. D., 206, 225, 235, 243, 259-60
Lyon, H. B., 62-3

MacDonald, Donald, 7-8
MacDonald, G. E., 202
Mackay, J. H., 207, 250, 269-70, 275, 284
MacKinley, F. R., 156
Macy, W. G., 27-8, 44
Macy, Matthew, 28
Madison, C. A., 275, 285
Magee, J. D., 32
Malone, Dumas, 5
Malatesta, Errico, 220, 222
Mark, Irving, 48
Marx, Karl, 56, 214, 223, 226-9, 286-7
Masquerier, Lewis, 45, 66, 115, 140
Martyn, Carlos, 183
Maximov, G. P., 287
McDonald, A. J., 3, 38-9, 43, 71
McKinley, Pres. William, 258, 268, 291
McParlan, James, 121
Mencken, H. L., 202
Mendum, J. P., 232
Merriam, C. E., viii, ix, 284-5
Merrick, W. D., 170
Meulen, Henry, 202
Michaux, Francois, 40
Michel, Louise, 220
Michels, Robert, 277
Mill, James, 256
Miller, H. E., 127
Moore, D. D. T., 70
Morison, S. E., 4
Morse, Minnie, 80
Morse, S. H., 206, 242
Mosca, Gaetano, viii, 277
Most, Johann, 220, 222-6, 235, 260, 286
Mott, F. L., 24
Mulberger, Arthur, 287

Naquet, Alfred, 283
Neebe, Oscar, 266-7
Nettlau, Max, 57, 59, 67, 69, 77, 88, 90-1, 94, 139, 279-83, 286
Newton, R. H., 253
Nichols, T. L., 14, 67, 71, 73-6, 82, 156
Nichols, Mary S. G., 156
Nicholson, Meredith, 40, 43, 80, 95
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 254
Nold, Carl, 247
Nomad, Max, 56, 278
Nordau, Max, 270
Noyes, J. H., viii, 3-4, 39, 43, 57-60, 71, 74, 84, 116, 165, 286
Noyes, Pierrepont, 3

O'Connor, M. J. L., 127
Odegard, Peter, 123
Orvis, Clark, 80
Orvis, John, 114-6, 119, 135, 137, 206
Osgood, H. L., 284
Oswald, J. C., 31
Owen, David Dale, 43
Owen, Robert, v, xii, 3, 6-8, 10-6, 18-9, 22, 28, 40, 44-6, 53 76, 84, 88-90, 94-5, 144, 147-8, 204, 286
Owen, Richard, 7, 40
Owen, Robert Dale, 7-8, 24-7, 43, 45, 65
Owen, William, 7-8, 12
Owen, W. C., 261

Pancoast, Elinor, 24
Pare, William, 89-91
Pareto, Vilfredo, 270
Parker, Mary, 292
Parker, R. A., 3
Parker, Theodore, 72, 135
Parrington, V. L., 21, 288
Parsons, A. R., 222, 225, 259, 266
Partridge, C. S., 47
Pelham, W. C., 8
Pelham, William, 8
Pentecost, H. O., 261
Perkins, A. J. G., 24, 39
Perlman, Selig, 285
Perovskaya, Sophie, 219
Perry, Elliott, 172
Persons, Stow, 286
Petegorsky, D. W., viii
Phillips, Wendell, 116, 180, 183-5
Pickering, John, 20, 31

Piotrowski, S. A., 4
Pi y Margall, Francisco, 72
Plekhanov, G. V., 283
Podmore, Frank, 6-7, 16, 89
Poor, Martin, 63
Post, Albert, 29, 168
Post, Louis, 253
Powderly, T. V., 244
Prescott, Daniel, 58
Prescott, George, 62
Proudhon, P. J., iii, xii, 11-2, 56, 94, 109, 120, 132, 134, 137, 142, 162, 203, 205-7, 213, 223, 226, 228, 241, 253, 270, 275-6, 281, 286-7
Pullman, George, 264
Pyat, Felix, 269

Raffalovich, Sophie, 270
Rapp, George, 7
Reclus, Elie, 206
Reclus, Elisee, 220, 223
Redlich, Fritz, 127
Reese, Rena, 280
Reeves, J. S., 153
Reitzel, Robert, 270
Replogle, Georgia, 254
Replogle, Henry, 254
Richardson, J. D., 200
Riley, T. A., 284
Ripley, George, 4, 72, 156
Robinson, J. B., 207, 235, 250, 253, 274
Robinson, Solon, 47
Rocker, Rudolf, v, x, 224, 279
Rodbertus, J. K., 11
Roosevelt, Pres. Theodore, 263
Ross, Dr. W. H., 68, 70, 83
Rotch, Charity, 28
Rousseau, J. J., 252
Rowe, M. W., 44
Rowe, William, 116, 140
Rudiger, Helmut, x
Russbuldt, Wilhelm, 71
Russell, E. F., 87
Rynin, David, 32

Sacco, Nicola, 275
Sachs, E. L., 203, 279
Saint Beuve, 206
Sanborn, A. F., x
Santayana, George, 9
Saposs, D. J., 4, 285
Sargant, W. L., 6
Sassulich, Vera, 220
Saunders, S. H., 22
Schaack, Michael, 242
Schapiro, J. S., 287
Scheltema, Annie Adama van, 282
Schlesinger, A. M., Sr., 28
Schneck, Jacob, 7, 40
Schneider, H. W., 287
Schriner, Olive, 261
Schroeder, Theodore, 261
Schulder, Fred, 258
Schumm, Emma, 226
Schumm, George, 202-3, 226, 250, 270
Schurz, Carl, 122
Schuster, E. M., viii, 5, 279, 284
Schwab, Eugene L., 48
Schwab, Justus, 266-7
Seaver, Horace, 232
Seligman, E. R. A., 4, 38
Senter, Amos E., 61
Semicoli, E., 282
Sewall, Jonathan, 133
Seymour, Henry, 92, 166
Shaw, G. B., 202, 270
Shaw, W. B., 153
Simpson, E. H., 255
Small, A. W., 238, 265
Small, J. T., 257
Smith, Adam, 12
Smith, Ashbel, 153
Smith, Bruce, 280
Smith, Gerrit, 81, 140, 147, 181
Smith, T. C., 181
Sotheran, Charles, 4, 156
Spencer, Herbert, 51, 120, 165, 203, 204-41, 254
Spies, August, 221, 225, 243, 266
Spooner, Lysander, xi, 100, 103, 113-4, 127, 145, 154, 167-201, 203, 206, 211, 214, 217, 242, 260, 266, 288
Sprading, C. T., 153, 167, 261, 274
Stammhammer, Joseph, 59, 80, 286
Stammler, Rudolf, 283
Stanton, E. C., 115-6, 124
Stearns, Bertha-Monica, 67, 74
Stedman, E. C., 159, 206
Stedman, Laura, 159
Stern, B. J., 238
Stewart, R. C., 9
Stirner, Max, 201, 203, 215, 235, 241, 249-61, 269, 283-4
St. John, A. W., 116
Studley, G. B., 83
Sumner, Charles, 135
Sumner, W. G., 235, 239
Swain, J. H., 221, 243
Swartz, C. L., x, 201-2, 257-8, 274
Swayne, N. H., 167
Sweasey, W. J., 42
Swinton, John, 161
Sylvis, William, 106-108, 114
Symes, Lillian, 279

Taft, Philip, 287
Tandy, F. D., 258, 260
Tansill, C. C., 199
Tcherkesoff, Vladimir, 56
Tchernychevsky, 269
Thompson, D. G., 236

Thompson, Elizabeth, 161
Thompson, William, 11, 88
Thoreau, H. D., v, viii, 205, 277
Ticknor, W. D., 135
Tilden, S. J., 262
Tillinghurst, W. H., 220
Tilton, Theodore, 162
Todes, Charlotte, 106
Tolstoi, Leo, 261, 269
Toohey, J. H. W., 122
Traubel, Horace, 269
Trinkaus, William, 255-6
Trowbridge, J. T., 161, 166
Tucker, B. R., xi, xii, 30, 48, 80, 88, 105, 114, 122-3, 125, 137-8, 147, 153 163-7, 172, 179-80, 200-2
Tucker, George, 127
Tyler, A. F., 2, 56, 288

Underhill, E. F., 159
Underhill, Samuel, 27-9, 168
Upson, Dewitt, 75

Vaillant, Edouard, 239
Van Amringe, W. H., 140
Vance, Sen. Z. B., 262
Vanzetti, Bartolomeo, 275
Varney, Maria, 46, 57, 66
Varney, Thomas, 46, 57, 66
Vater, Thomas, 63
Villetard, Edmond, 91
Vizetelly, E. A., iv
Voline (V. S. Eichenbaum), 287
Von Holst, Hermann, 265

Wade, Vice Pres. B. F., 161
Wagner, A. G., 261
Wakeman, T. B., 122, 232
Walker, Amasa, 177
Walker, E. C., 243, 247-8
Walker, J. L., 235, 243, 250, 253-4
Wallace, A. R., 151
Wanamaker, John, 269
Ward, Lester, 162, 165, 238
Warren, Caroline C., 5, 8, 76, 82-3, 93, 102
Warren, Caroline Maria, 5, 8, 39
Warren, George, 5, 19, 102, 293
Warren, George W., 5-6, 31, 35, 39, 42, 47
Warren, John, 9, 293
Warren, John C., 5
Warren, Gen. Joseph, 5
Warren, Capt. Josiah, 292
Warren, Josiah (II), 292
Warren, Josiah, xi, xii, 4-106, 116-9, 125, 137-8, 142, 146, 153-7, 160-4, 201, 203-4, 209, 213-4, 221, 250-1, 256-9, 277, 284-6, 288, 292-3
Warren, Lyman O., 9, 292-3
Warren, Richard, 293
Warren, Sidney, 124
Waterman, W. R., 23-5
Wattles, John O., 57
Webster, W. B., 292
Webster, Noah, 182
Wedberg, Anders, 185
Weisbord, Albert, 286
Weitling, Wilhelm, 4, 93-4
Weld, T. D., 124, 141, 201
Wellington, R. G., 34
Westrup, A. B., 151, 243, 255-6
Whitman, Walt, 269
Whittick, Wm., 261
Wilson, James G., 126
Windt, John, 140
Winkler, J. K., 71
Winn, Ross, 259-61
Winship, J. P. C., 293
Winstanley, Gerrard, viii
Wish, Harvey, 285
Wittke, Carl, 4
Wolfson, Theresa, 24, 39
Wood, C. E. S., 260
Woodhull, Victoria, 114-8, 160, 162, 203, 279
Wright, B. F., 185
Wright, Elizur, 122
Wright, Frances, 24-5, 32, 39, 46, 65
Wright, W. B., 205

Yarros, Victor, x, 185, 206, 234-241, 243, 249, 253-4, 264, 267
Youmans, E. L., 161
Young, Brigham, 166
Young, Marguerite, 3

Zenker, E. V., iv, vi, vii, 12, 93-4, 280-1
Zimand, Savel, 280
Zoccoli, Ettore, 281-3
Zucker, A. E., 270

. . . the starting point for anyone concerned with the antecedents of libertarianism in the United States . . .

MEN AGAINST THE STATE

by

James J. Martin

MEN AGAINST THE STATE first appeared in the spring of 1953. Within a matter of months it had received nearly fifty highly commendatory reviews in thirteen countries in seven languages. Few products of American scholarly research in our time have gained more widespread international respect in such a short time.

This book brought back into view a tradition which almost disappeared between the beginning of the First World War and the end of the Second, the philosophy and deeds of anti-statist libertarian voluntarism in the United States during the three generations which flourished between 1825 and 1910, in a style which a London commentator described as "a model of readable scholarship."

In the 1950s, the era of the "organization man" and almost unparalleled political passivity, MEN AGAINST THE STATE may have been a premature book, as some have observed, despite being reprinted two more times later in the decade. This quiet and unsensational circulation continued to further its reputation, nevertheless.

In the last ten years however it has been recognized by many as the starting point for anyone concerned with the antecedents of libertarianism in the United States. The spread of interest in such thinking among a new generation has prompted the reissuance of this book, in a conventionally-printed popularly priced edition for the first time.

RALPH MYLES PUBLISHER, INC.
Post Office Box 1533
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80901